NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

VOLUME V.---NO. 24. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 232.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
At 142, Nassau Street, New-York.

Sydney Howard Gay,
Maria Weston Chapman,
Edmund Quincy, } Editors.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.

Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—$2 00 a year, in advance; $2 50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10 00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies, for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1 50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post-Office Department: "A postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

"The Peculiar Institution."

AMERICAN SLAVE-TRADE.

The following letter of a traveller in North Carolina, was first published in the "Christian Advocate and Journal."

"Hail Columbia, happy land!"

There are at Washington City, at Norfolk, at Charleston, and perhaps some other places in the old States of the South, slave-markets, where slave-dealers may purchase upon speculation, such slaves as they can obtain, for the purpose of re-sale, at a profit, in the extreme South.

"As I went on board the steamboat, I noticed eight colored men, hand-cuffed, and chained together, in pairs, four women, and eight or ten children, of the apparent ages of from four to ten years, all standing in the bow of the boat, in charge of a man standing near them. Of the men, one was 60, one was 52, three of them about 30, two of them about 25, and one of them about 20 years of age, as I subsequently learned from them. The first two had children, the next three had wives and children, and the other three were single, but had parents living from them. Coming near them, I perceived they were all greatly agitated; and on inquiry I found that they were all slaves, who had been born and raised in North Carolina, and had just been sold to a speculator, who was now taking them to Charleston market. Upon the shore there were a number of colored persons, women and children, waiting the departure of the boat; and my attention was particularly attracted by four colored females, of uncommonly respectable appearance, neatly attired, who stood together, a little distance from the crowd, and upon whose countenances was depicted the keenest sorrow. As the last bell was tolling I saw the tears gushing from their eyes, and they raised their neat cotton aprons and wiped their faces, under the cutting anguish of severed affection. They were the wives of the two men in chains. There, too, were mothers and sisters, weeping at the departure of their sons and brothers; and there, too, were fathers, taking the last look of their wives and children. My whole attention was directed to those on the shore, as they seemed to stand in solemn, submissive silence, occasionally giving utterance to the intensity of their feelings by a sigh, or a stifled groan. As the boat was unloosed from her moorings, they cast a distressed, lingering look towards those on board, and turned away in silence. My eye now turned to those in the boat; although I tried to control my feelings, amidst my sympathies for those on shore, I could conceal them no longer, and I found myself literally "weeping with those that weep." I stood near them, and when one of the husbands saw his wife on the shore wave her hand for the last time, in token of her affection, his manly efforts to restrain his feelings, gave way, and fixing his watery eyes upon her, he exclaimed: "This is the most distressing scene of all! My dear wife and children, farewell!" The husband of the other wife stood weeping in silence, with his manacled hands raised to his face, as he looked upon her for the last time. Of the poor women on board, three of them had husbands, whom they left behind. One of them had three children, another had two, and the third none. These husbands and fathers were amidst the throng on the shore, witnessing the departure of their wives and children, and as they took their leave of them they were sitting together upon the floor of the boat, sobbing in silence, but giving utterance to no complaint. But the distressing scene was not yet ended. Sailing down the Cape Fear River, twenty-five miles, we touched at the village of Smithport, on the south side of the river. It was at this place that one of the slaves lived, and here was his wife and five children; and while at work on Monday last his purchaser took him away from his family, and carried him in chains to Wilmington, where he had since remained in jail. As we approached the wharf, a flood of tears gushed from his eyes, and anguish seemed to have pierced his heart. The boat stopped but a moment, and as she left, he bid farewell to some of his acquaintance upon the shore, exclaiming, "Boys, I wish you well; tell Molly (meaning his wife) and the children, I wish them well, and hope God will bless them." At that moment he espied his wife on the stoop of a house, some rods from the shore, and with one hand which was not in the hand-cuffs, he pulled off his old hat, and waving it toward her, exclaimed, "Farewell." As he saw by the waving of her apron, that she recognized him, he leaned back upon the railing, and in a faltering voice repeated, "Farewell, forever." After a moment's silence, conflicting passions seemed to tear his heart, and he exclaimed, "What have I done that I should deserve this doom? Oh, my wife and children, I want to live no longer!" and when the bitter tear rolled down his cheek, which he wiped away with the palm of his unchained hand, he looked once more at the mother of his five children, till the turning of the boat hid her face from him forever. As I looked around I saw that mine was not the only heart that had been affected by the scene, but that the tears standing in the eyes of many of my fellow-passengers, bore testimony to the influence of human sympathy, and I could, as an American citizen, standing within the limits of one of the old thirteen States, but repeat the language of Mr. Jefferson, in relation to the general subject, "I tremble when I think that God is just." After we left Smithport, I conversed freely with all these persons; and in intelligence and respectability of appearance, the three men who had thus been torn from their families, would compare favorably with the respectable portion of the colored men at the North. This is a specimen of what almost daily occurs in the business of the slave-trade.

"Yours, in the bonds of the gospel,
A. C."

From the Western Citizen.

NEW ORLEANS SLAVE-MARKET
BY A GERMAN GENTLEMAN.

Mr. G. said he espied a large and splendidly decorated edifice, to all appearance intended as a sort of "exchange," or place of recreation, mental and physical, for those who have leisure and taste for such enjoyments. He entered, and after sauntering through a number of apartments, he came to a very handsome arched way with the word "Arcade over it. He approached, and saw several colored men, women, and children, well dressed, making a good appearance, standing and sitting about. He ask them what was to be done there? One of them, an elderly, thoughtful looking woman, who was holding by the hand a little bright-eyed boy, replied that there was a public sale of slaves, and that if he wished to attend, he could step into the lawn, pointing at the same time to a large green space, or outer court, beautifully decorated with trees. He went, and such a sight was presented as he wished never again to behold. The flag of American Liberty, as if in mockery, was waving over the scene. From fifty to a hundred men, women, and children, were distributed over the place waiting their turn to ascend the stand and be "knocked off" to the highest bidder. Many of the women and girls were beautiful, modest-looking females, all well dressed, for it is the policy of the owner to have them appear well, just as he would rub down a horse that he was about to offer for sale. The white men would come up and examine them to see if they were whole and sound in "limb and body," some of them forgetting all decency in the examination, paid no regard whatever to the shrinking modesty of women, but would reiterate the qualities they required, and the auctioneer in crying them off, would enumerate the personal attractions suited to the tastes of the licentious purchaser. Thus they kept on until the "ear was pained and the heart sick," said my informant, and I went again into the room before mentioned. There sat the bright little boy beside his mother, whose heart seemed too full to be relieved by tears. I asked her why she was so sad. "Ah," she said, "in a little while I and my boy, my only solace, will be offered for sale, and I fear we shall be separated; he is all to me, and should he be torn away, I shall be wretched indeed." I left the apartment to weep, and as I could afford no relief, to get away from the heart-rending scene, but was presently aroused by the cries and lamentations of the afflicted mother, who had just been "knocked off" to a cruel purchaser, and her darling boy to some one else. Her tears and entreaties availed nothing, the child was thrown into a cart and driven off; the mother beaten and manacled, led away to jail, from thence to be taken far from all her soul held dear. I gazed at the eagle and stars, and could but exclaim,—Freedom, thou art but a name.

Pro-Slavery.

From the Liberty Press.

"THE SWEET CAKE PARTY."

MR. EDITOR: I noticed an article in the "National Anti-Slavery Standard," of the 17th instant, under the caption, "Proscription among the Colored People." The article fills two columns of that large sheet, and purports to be a report of a meeting held in New-York city on the Friday evening preceding. I am aware that nothing that may come from the editor of that paper touching the character of a Liberty man can be considered slander, for no one suspects him of telling the truth. I hope you will pardon me for noticing the scurrilous article through the columns of your paper. If my character alone had been assailed, I should have done on this occasion as I have hitherto—I should have "let him alone severely." But he has not only attacked me, but he has libeled the noble and patriotic sons of New-York, who in all their State Conventions, have shown their attachment to Liberty.

The report was made by Sydney Howard Gay, and I must say that I never read an article in Mr. Bennett's Herald that contained half so many vulgar lies. When I saw Mr. Gay in the meeting, being "set on" by the leaders of the "sweet cake men," I concluded he was one of the Herald's reporters for I did not know the man. But I was mistaken, for every honest man who attended the meeting will testify that, in point of veracity, Sydney Howard Gay belongs to a class several steps below the Herald.

Before I proceed to examine the false report of this notorious man, and Dr. Smith, it may be well for me to give you a short account of the "sweet cake party." The two great leaders of the party are, 1st. Mr. Stephen Myres, of Albany, now editor of a Temperance paper, called the Pioneer—also formerly General Agent, and a shareholder of "The Northern Star"—also formerly Agent for the "Advocate"—and also lately General Agent of the Northern Star and Clarksonian. Since Mr. Pennington wisely disengaged himself from Mr. Myres, the "Pioneer" has become the organ of this "sweet cake party"—and, according to its prospectus, it is neither for God nor for Satan—it says, "in politics and religion this paper will be strictly neutral." Yet its neutral policy leads it to attack the Liberty Party in every number—indeed, it does in the very prospectus. 2d. Dr. Smith, of New-York, treads in the footsteps of his illustrious leader, and while he was editor of the "Northern Star," every week he rushed with Quixotic fury upon the Liberty Party. In those articles he manifested the greatest bitterness towards Messrs. Birney, Stanton, Leavitt, and Prof. Wright, and many other faithful friends of freedom, whose names are enrolled far beyond the short-sight of James McCune Smith, M. D. This party are at home, when they are fawning around the feet of their oppressors. When their masters desire them to do a piece of dirty work, they give them a small loaf of sweet cake, and, spaniel like, they hunt down their own race to disgrace them. Sometimes they receive a few dollars to support their worthless papers. Sometimes, just before elections, they are taken into the back parlors of their oppressors—that is, when everybody else has gone abroad. Then they are stroked on the head, and while the polls are open, they are called "the trustiest of their kind." The language of Dr. Smith, in reference to the members of the Liberty Party is, "they are political aspirants"—they are trying to ride into office over the broken hearts of the bleeding slave." Pro-slavery editors say, "Ah, he is a noble fellow," and then they give him and his party another loaf of sweet cake. This pitiable company is very small, as the proceedings of our Conventions will show. They have never been able to carry a single measure. The people, yes, thank God, the people hold them in utter contempt. They are as decidedly pro-slavery as any party this side of South Carolina.

They sympathize no more with the Old Organization than they do with the New. I am, therefore, at a loss to know how they succeeded in obtaining Sydney Howard Gay to write falsehoods for them. Perhaps they passed the sweet cake to him—and the man must get his living. This same Dr. Smith, two years ago, attacked and blackguarded, in public meeting, in New-York, that able and eloquent herald of freedom, C. Lenox Remond. And what had he done? He was invited to speak, and uttered some plain and simple Anti-Slavery truth, at which Dr. Smith took umbrage. Truly, Pilate and Herod have renewed friendship.

I am happy to say that we had a most glorious Convention, notwithstanding the attempt of the "sweet cake men" to break it up. No doubt that but the leaders expected that their withdrawal from the Convention would have about the same effect, as did the Great Red Dragon from Heaven, who drew the third part of the stars with his tail. But the stars did not follow. No, not even the "Northern Star" which is so prone to wander, could he draw that time—and "there's the rub."

Here follows the protest which the people would not allow to disgrace their minutes. Read it carefully, for you may never see its like again:—[See Standard, Oct. 24.]

This wonderfully foolish protest carries an antidote for its own poison. Any honest man is called upon to show what part of the two resolutions, quoted in the protest, commits the colored people of New-York to the Liberty Party. The writer of this article was not the author of the above resolutions: if he had been, he would have been more definite. Any educated man who will say that the Whigs or Democrats have *not* neglected and refused to do our people justice, is "more knave than fool."

This "sweet cake party" is certainly the littlest, and narrowest party in existence. The smallest room in Lilliput would accommodate a mass meeting of a hundred thousand of them. They say that Anti-Slavery and Temperance are subjects that are extraneous to the objects of a State Convention. And why? Because they are pro-slavery, and some of them wine bibbers. Let it be understood, that the creed of freemen declares, that "nothing is foreign to them that interests man." Liberty "extraneous!" O, what philanthropists these men are! New-York may congratulate herself that such men are few and far between.

They say that it will not do for them to speak the truth in regard to these parties, because they are, and long have been, our cruel oppressors, and because we are looking for favors from them! They *do favor* us as cats favor mice—

"They first do play,
And after slay."

They further tell us that, inasmuch as we do not know into whose hands we shall fall, we must pray "good Lord and good Devil."

All of the article in reference to myself at the Governor's house is an utter falsehood. I denied the whole statement at the Convention, and Mr. Thompson very meekly said—"Well, that may go for what it may fetch—I may be mistaken."

The Convention at Schenectady was the first that Dr. Smith has ever attended, out of the city. His sole object in attending the meeting was to carry through the protest, which he contemplated doing in the morning of the first day, and to go home in the afternoon. Wonderful patriotism! Consummate conceit! No doubt but that this heroic leader of the "sweet cake men" intended carrying home Cæsar's report—*veni, vidi, vici.* But the noble freemen—the people, gave him another—"I came, I saw, and I ran." No sooner did these men behold the fate of their puerile protest, than they availed themselves of the swiftness of the Hudson River steamboats.

The sudden exit of a part of this party from the Convention, reminded me of the exit of a certain militia captain from a field of battle in the Revolutionary war. He was as bold as a lion while he had nothing else to do but to march after martial music. But when, as Carlyle would say, the cry began to be, "I kill, thou killest, he kills, we kill, you kill, and they kill," the Captain said to his men, "Right about, and left about, every man for himself, and I for New-York," and dashing his spurs into his steed, he suited the action to the word.

As to the public meeting in New York, at which Mr. Sydney Howard Gay writes that Dr. Smith's report was adopted by a majority of eight, that gentleman has departed far from the truth, and I presume he knew it. I appeal to more than a hundred men and women who attended that meeting, whether the editor of the Standard has told the truth.—The President of the meeting (Mr. Bell) declared at one time that the vote was a tie. One of the gentlemen appointed to count, said that there were forty-two yeas, and the other said there were thirty-four. The secretary said there were 37 nays.* Mr. Zuille, who sympathised with the protesters, rose, and declared, amid great confusion, that he saw one man pass by, and vote four times for the sweet cake report. Others did the same. Finally the meeting adjourned, at the hour of 2, A. M., without taking the vote. At the adjourned meeting, I am informed, they did not attempt to bring up the famous report. If Mr. Sydney Howard Gay knew this, his fame for veracity will not spread far. If he did not know it, then his ignorance is inexcusable. I now "leave him alone in his glory."

Posterity will place this protest by the side of the celebrated "Clerical Protest," and by the side of the "Disclaimer," which a certain colored clergyman of New-York issued during the mobs of 1835, while the Abolitionists, both white and colored, were burning in ruins, and while women and children were chased through the streets like wild beasts. The disclaimer declared that the writer had nothing to do with the Abolitionists, and that he had always told the Anti-Slavery people not to advance the colored people faster than they were prepared! Indeed I am proud to say, that even this generation will place the broad seal of infinite contempt upon this pro-slavery party. It is extremely small, and it cannot increase. The friends of freedom throughout the world may be assured that the colored American citizens are on the side of humanity. In our National Convention, when we had men from various parts of the free States, they stood manfully by the principles of Liberty. The young lions of Cincinnati, the Queen of the West—the sons of Michigan and Illinois, and New-York, and Connecticut, all bowed around the altar of Liberty, and dedeclared that they were prepared to make any sacrifice for her defence.

I would say to my brethren, that the reason I have not noticed these people before, is because I hated to expose their deep shame to the world. It has hitherto been painful for me to contend with my own people, but hereafter I shall treat all slavocrats alike, both white and colored. "We will meet them again at Phillippi." In behalf of the people,

HENRY HIGHLAND GARNET.

TROY, October 24, 1844.

*There was a majority of eight in favor of the Report, according to the count of the teller of the opposition.—ED.

THAT ROORBACK.

The more decent of the Whig papers have entirely ceased from the agitation of the Saginaw nomination. They have discovered that their gross assaults upon Mr. Birney were producing a strong reaction, and that good men of their own party, as well as all parties, would not justify their base attempts to ruin the fame of a man who had given such indisputable proofs of purity of character, unbending integrity and extensive philanthropy. The little fry, such for instance as the Bugle Blast, Madison County Eagle, the Liberator, and the National Anti-Slavery Standard, are still making a pompous display of types, expressive of the moral ugliness of the spirits that preside over them! Verily, they will have *their* reward!—*Liberty Press.*

Selections.

MRS. WORK'S LETTER.

This letter was laid aside some time since for publication, but was crowded out. Many of our readers probably have not seen it.

THEOPOLIS, Ill. Aug. 13, 1844.

DEAR SIR: I received your kind letter this afternoon, and I will improve the first opportunity to answer it, for I truly believe I have found a friend in a stranger; and a friend in need is a friend indeed. Many a stranger has sympathized with me whom I never saw, and never expect to see, this side the grave; but I trust I shall meet them in Heaven, where we shall tune our harps and sing hallelujah to the Lamb.

When my husband went away, I and my children were dependent upon him for our daily bread; my health was not good when he went away. Myself and youngest child a little girl eighteen months old, were forty miles from home at the time he went, which was on Monday, and I got home the next Friday, with my little girl sick in my arms, and found my youngest son quite sick. As soon as I got into the house, my eldest son, of the age of nine years, said to me, "Mother; where is father? he went away on Monday, and we have not seen him since." Judge what were my feelings at that moment. I was at home but a few moments before I heard he was in Palmyra jail, in Missouri. In two weeks I went over to see him, and saw him upon an average once a week while he was in jail, which was more than eight weeks. I do not know how they could live so long there in so small a place. I have been to Jefferson twice, and expect to go (if the Lord spares my life, and gives me strength and means, again next November, when the Legislature sits, and plead with them for the release of my husband. But I will drop this subject and write upon the one you wished me to.

We have a small house, which I have called our own, but how long I can do so I know not, for the Sheriff came out yesterday morning and handed me a writ, to appear at the Court House the third Monday in September, to answer to a certain bill of complaint. Where it will end I know not. It is for the Lawyer's fee in Missouri. I am owing some cash debts; one, which is the most, (except the Lawyer's fee,) is about twenty dollars: it was thirty-nine, but some friends in Connecticut sent me some money some time ago, and I paid the other part. The man I owe it to lives somewhere in the eastern States; he has sent out twice to have it sued, but if he will have patience I will pay him all. If it had not been for kind friends, I do not know where I should have been now. No living being but myself knows the troubles and trials I have passed through for the last three years. I am a woman of sorrow, and acquainted with grief. My health has been growing poorer and poorer ever since my husband went away, though I am able to attend to my work. I wash for three students and take in a little sewing. They pay me in work again, or let me have orders; but I cannot always get the most needful articles with them, such as groceries and flour. I am willing to do what I can to get a living, but my family requires a good deal of my time. I am troubled to get a sufficiency of flour: we live mostly on the coarse article. Perhaps you do not know what that is; the superfine is taken out of the wheat, and then the fine, and this I use is the next. I do not say this to complain, for I should be glad to get enough even of that. I have had but a very little meat in my house for a good while. A friend sent me a few pounds of pork the other day, which I thankfully received. I have seen the time since my husband went away, that I would have been glad of bran to make bread of. It has got to be an *old story*, his being in prison. There is but little said or done about it. You wish me to tell you what will make my family comfortable. It is hard for me to tell. I have learned to get along with little. My master knows what we need, and has sent me help more than once when I was ready to despair. I must trust in the Lord for a supply, (for he is kind—and your kindness shows it,) for the remainder of the summer, and the coming fall and winter. You may think I look a great ways a head. I do not know that I shall live till that time, but I remember the winter that has gone by, and what we suffered. I can bear cold and hunger much better than I can see my children bear it. Many a time have we shivered over a few embers; and I have waded through the snow for wood and to take care of my cow, till my clothes were frozen near a quarter of a yard deep. Many a time last winter did I travel miles through the snow to find my cow. For want of food she wandered off, and I do not know but she will have to do the same the coming winter. You may think I tell you a great deal, but the one half I have not told you.

If the friends can spare bed clothing, or winter clothes or shoes, or any such thing, or clothing of any kind, I should be very glad, for I think I could exchange some of them for food, and some of them I want. I know money is very scarce. One of the teachers has gone east, and I heard that himself or his agent was going to Vermont to get something, if he could, for the institution here. If you and the friends could, without robbing yourselves, send me a small box by this man, I think the Lord will reward you. It is a great favor to ask, and I will not urge it. If you shall see fit to send a box, will you put in a paper containing the names of the donors. It would be a comfort to me to read them over.

I am glad to hear you speak so much about Freedom. If you were as near a slave State as I am, you would want to give in *two votes to a man*. I live two miles from the Mississippi river, which divides Illinois from Missouri. I have four children. I have buried one since my husband went to prison. I have a little son added to my family since he went away. His name is Alanson. He is in his third year. People that come here ask him where his father is. He tells them he is in the *penetencia*. They ask him what they shall do to the men who put him there. He says, pay them about the penting of their sins: that is, pray about their repenting of their sins. I think my husband's being taken was the cause of my little girl's death. She would be in her cradle from morning to night, and call for her father, till she pined away and died. The day but one before she died she called for paper, and said she wanted to write to father. The night before she died, (I was watching with her—it was past midnight—no one in the house but my children, and they asleep. It was a very cold night, and I had no wood cut for a fire, and I was shaking with the cold,) she went into a fit, and I held her in my arms, I should think ten minutes that she did not breathe. I awakened my eldest child and sent for a neighbor. She did not breathe when the neighbor came. After she had been there awhile, Ellen came partly out the fit, and went into another, which she never came out of. O! I thought if my husband had been here at the time, what would I have given! But no, it could not be. There is a world which we are looking forward to, where sorrowing and sighing will be done away, and where the wicked will cease from troubling, and the weary be at rest. Perhaps you have not been called to wade through the furnace of affliction; but with me I sometimes think it has been heated one seven times hotter than before. But the Lord's will, not mine be done.

My husband wishes me to go into Missouri and circulate petitions. I have already went three times, and exposed life and health, and I am willing to do it again if I can get him released; but my faith is weak. Kind sir, pray for me and mine.

Yours truly, AURELIA A. WORK.

From the Northern Star and Clarksonian.

THE LIBERTY PARTY.—No. iv.

MR. EDITOR:—Having (while I had the honor to be your colleague) investigated the means by which the Liberty Party aims to overthrow slavery, the next topic in order is, "*the principles of the Liberty Party.*"

The letter of Alvan Stewart, of Utica, bearing date June 1st, 1844, presents an array of the principles of this party, which bears the seal of authority, coming from him as "Chairman of the National Liberty Committee," appointed by "the United States Convention at Buffalo." It is true, that *all* the United States were not represented at this Convention—some naughty States south of Mason and Dixon's line having refrained from sending delegates thereto—but what of that? All were asked to send representatives, and are therefore as solemnly bound by the edicts of the Convention, and by the gyrations of its Committee's Chairman, as they are by the mandates of the man in the moon. It is equally true that the principles of this manifesto are very different from the don't-care-a-fig-about-the-Constitution dogmas of the Buffalo National Convention; what of that? He was appointed Chairman to a Committee, to obtain office to destroy Slavery, and so long as he obtains office, why should he pay any more respect to the principles of the Convention, than the Convention did to the Constitution of the United States?

The Buffalo Convention aimed to overthrow Slavery in spite of the Constitution of the United States. Alvan Stewart proposes to abolish Slavery in accordance with the letter of the Constitution. Of the two modes there can be no doubt that the latter is most sound in principle. To alter and abolish existing evils by means of, and according to the method pointed out by, existing compacts and laws, is the only safe way of reform. It is the way pointed out by the natural law, and eloquently illustrated in all the history of mankind.

The main principle being good, let us examine the subordinate principles. Mr. Stewart says, in the letter alluded to, "The past year has been peculiarly fortunate, and marked by a deliberate opinion, which is now grown to be universal in our ranks, that the Constitution of our country is, when properly interpreted, an Anti-Slavery Constitution." He goes on to say, in substance, "that whatever may have been the opinions of the framers of the Constitution, they wrote a text in itself anti-slavery; that the "framers" were only "reporters" of the Constitution, and their views are of no account: that the nine States which "adopted" the Constitution as it was, with a clear Anti-Slavery Preamble, and hence they considered it as it was written, an Anti-Slavery document; and under it, and in accordance with right interpretation of it, the Liberty Party can abolish Slavery in the slave States through the powers granted to the General Government."

Let us examine this principle of the Liberty Party. It is a principle based upon what Theologians call Hermeneutics—or interpretation. Of course it must be tried by the laws of interpretation. The first and soundest interpretation is, that "that interpretation of a text is correct, which can be proven to be in strict accordance with the way in which the people understood it at the time when the text was uttered." How did the people—the adopters—in 1787-8, understand the Constitution? Did they understand it as an Anti-Slavery Constitution? Excepting Vermont and Massachusetts, all the States, at that time were slaveholding States. This fact is generallly overlooked; for, by a curious anachronism, we are apt to think and say that the same opposition of free and slave States existed then, as now, in 1844: when the fact is, that Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New-York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, &c. were, in 1787, all slave States. How did these States at that time—how did all the States regard the newly adopted Constitution? Did they adopt it as an Anti-Slavery instrument? Certainly not: for they did not abolish Slavery. On the contrary, they continued Slavery; and by that act, showed that they believed Slavery and the Constitution perfectly compatible. So that the testimony of the very witnesses summoned by Mr. Stewart, gives the Constitution a pro-slavery character. And the principles of interpretation pronounce his interpretation to be false.

But Mr. Stewart relies upon the Preamble of the Constitution, in which the framers and the adopters tell the world that they did ordain the Constitution "to establish Justice." Had they understood "justice," in the same sense in which Mr. Stewart does—justice to the master, the equal, and no more than the equal, of the slave—then his inference would be correct. Did they so understand "justice?" If they did, they would immediately have abolished Slavery in every State which adopted the Constitution. But they did not regard the slave as the equal of his master. It was a prevalent opinion in the law, the philosophy and the religion of that day, that the negro was, in fact, an inferior being; and from this opinion, they argue the "justice" of making him a slave. Thomas Jefferson* has recorded this as the opinion of the time in question. It was "justice" to white men that the framers and adopters meant: had they meant "justice" to all men, they would not have continued to keep them in Slavery. Hence they did not use the word "justice" in its anti-slavery sense; nor can this sense be forced upon the "preamble," as adopted by them.

Mr. Stewart further argues that the Constitution, as understood by its adopters, when it speaks of "three-fifths of all other persons," regards a person as a "human being with natural rights," and not as a "chattel," which the laws of the slave States defines a slave to be. But the slave laws do not, universally, regard a slave as a chattel, (Stroud's Laws of Slavery, p. 1 and 2,) but as a person. The word person does not in fact mean "a human being with natural rights:" it simply expresses individual, animate existence; the *individuality*, but not the relations, or qualities of a human being. The Constitution, as understood by its framers and adopters, meant "slaves" by these "other persons." The clause of the Constitution states that "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, * * * by adding to the whole number of *free persons*, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of *all other persons.*" It is clear that these "other persons" could not be "free persons," or they would not have been uselessly distinguished: they were not Indians; who were they? They must have been slaves; because, the adopters of the Constitution, immediately enumerated their slaves, and apportioned representatives to the number of slaves as "*three-fifths of all other persons.*" Mr. Stewart says, and with truth, "No latent villany of intention of the frauds," (he might have added "*or interpreters,*") "can supersede the understanding of the adopters, and become the Constitution in lieu of the plain one adopted."

Thus the framers and adopters of the Constitution recognized slave representation, and have incorporated the system of slavery into our Republican *form* of Government, by an instrument (the Constitution) instituted to "secure the blessings of liberty to *us* and *our posterity*. What becomes of that power to abolish Slavery in the slave States, which Mr. Stewart claims for Congress, under the clause, "the United States shall guarantee to each State a Republican form of Government?" Could Congress call upon a State to adopt a Republican form of Government different from that form on which Congress itself is elected? So much for Alvan Stewart's interpretation of the Constitution. According to the testimony of his own witnesses, according to the soundest principles of interpretation, his interpretation is false and forced. His own witnesses did not understand the Constitution as he says they did. His mode of abolishing Slavery, therefore, is not sound in principle. Far from carrying out that most glorious reform, Immediate Emancipation, by means of existing institutions, he would force the measure by a plain violation of these institutions. Having obtained the reins of Government, should the Liberty party adopt and carry out his views, they would attempt the abolition of Slavery by means no less dangerous to our Republican Government, than is Slavery itself. For if one party in power, by a forced interpretation of the Constitution, should interefere with the State laws, and abolish Slavery in the States, where would be the hindrance, should another party, coming into power, determine to establish Slavery? The individuality, the sovereignty of the States, will have passed away as an obsolete idea: "the Government," aided by its Prœtorian bands, would be the sole depository of all power—the power to interpret, and the power to enforce its interpretations.

There is a party, growing in number and in vigor, which holds it to be as wrong for one man to own property in a thousand broad acres, as it is for another man to own property in a thousand slaves. These agrarians are a grasping race. Is Alvan Stewart aware that these men, who may come into power shortly after the Liberty Party have had their turn—is he aware that these men, following out the principles of interpretation, may go to Utica and despoil him of his right and title to the broad lands and splendid mansion, in which he writes so touchingly, of "hands stiffened in earning honest poverty's frugal meal?" Doubtless they will be able to prove (to their own satisfaction) that the Constitution says nothing about a perpetual tenure of one man in a portion of God's earth: and the rest will easily follow from the doctrine of this new "interpreter" of the Constitution.

There are other views in this letter of Mr. Stewart which must be briefly noticed. Speaking of the more thorough organization of the Liberty Party, he says, "The State Committees should call a Convention in each State forthwith, for organization, *not to listen to long speeches to prove Slavery a sin*, but to cut the State into sections, and to send a man with a loaded wagon of tracts into each section." So then, it has come to this: the Liberty Party have not *time to "show the sinfulness of Slavery!"* Hear it, Bishop Andrews, and flourish your crozier and your slave whip! Hear it you Christian mansellers of the South, and strike hands with your political abolition brethren at the North! Hear it—oh no! do not listen to it ye striped and lacerated slaves! lest, in your agony, ye give up all hope, and "curse God and die!"

Will any one dare say that this is not changing the whole issue of the Anti-Slavery question? The sin of Slavery is the awful feature which makes it most horrible, and which alone can be successfully attacked through the consciences of a Christian people. If this issue be abandoned for one moment, the whole issue is changed; and, in the present instance, changed for what? Hear Mr. Stewart: "Do not listen to that man who says vote with me for Clay this year, and I will vote with you hereafter; for if you fall into this snare you are probably both undone and will be left in a blind and reprobate state to grope your way to life's end, and on a death-bed be for the first time made conscious that in that *pro-slavery vote* you sent the representative of Christ to the dungeon and made his wife desolate and his children orphans—yea you continued them slaves. From such a death bed 'good Lord deliver us.'" From this irreverent admixture of blashemy and demagogueism, it would appear, that there is no time "to prove Slavery a sin;" but there is abundance of time to prove the sinfulness of not voting for Birney (and Alvan Stewart of course); nay, time sufficient to

"Deal damnation round the land,"

on all who might vote for Clay. What becomes of the voters for Polk? Is there some Liberty Party "limbo" reserved for them?

In the same letter Mr. Stewart shows the importance of electing town officers and county officers—modesily omitting anything about the Gubernatorial chair, for which he is candidate—as a means of abolishing Slavery by the Liberty Party. Not burdened with like modesty, but with a more giant grasp, Mr. Birney records his opinion, that the PRESIDENT alone has the power to abolish Slavery in the slave States! Without waiting to inquire what becomes of these small fry who are looking to the "town pickings," and whom Mr. Stewart so considerately provides for, let us hear Mr. Birney. Gentlemen Editors of the Albany Weekly Patriot, and of the Hartford Christian Freeman, ye who knocked down our "our man of straw," and metamorphosed us into and "owl," for our ignorance of the principles of the Liberty Party—listen! See what pleasant "*dreams*," "Birney the Just" hath!

In a letter to Mr. Errett, of Pittsburgh, dated Lower Saginaw, Michigan, August 5th, 1844, Mr. Birney says: "But you are ready to ask, how could the Liberty Party, if in power, extinguish Slavery, seeing, as is admitted on nearly all hands, that the General Government—except as a *war* measure, to save *itself*—has no Constitutional power over that institution in the *States?* I reply—all that is necessary to be done, is, for the *appointing power* of the General Government to bring into its offices and stations of honor, and trust, and, throughout the South, only such men as are *not* slaveholders—only such as practically acknowledge that all men are created equal, and entitled to their lives and liberty. No objection can be made to the constitutionality of such a course. It is as simple, too, as it is constitutional, and it will be found as effectual as it is simple. * * The slaveholders would at first huddle together for their mutual defence; but it would be unavailing. They could no more withstand the influence of public opinion, now purified by an illustrious act of justice, and flaming on them from every side, than the snow-drift of an April night can withstand the meridian rays of the next day's sun."—[*See Albany Patriot Oct.* 2d, 1844.]

Alvan Stewart, what a pair of Judys we are! You, for writing, we for reviewing an argument, to show the Constitution Anti-Slavery: and that by means of that instrument Slavery may be abolished, &c. &c. "Birney the Just," the *dreamer*, the statesman, the poet, has cut the Gordian knot: make *him* President, and by virtue of his office, he will scatter Slavery from the face of the States, "as an April sun would scatter an April snow-drift." And ye Liberty men that have looked for "town offices," brighten up! Enlarge your views! "Look to be Dukes at least." The fair El Dorado of the South, with its profusion of offices, and an open Government coffer, woo your patriotic embraces by the decree of "Birney the Just." No matter about the "town offices." No matter about the single dollar, there are heaps ahead! No matter about electing the retiring, the modest, the self-not-naming-Stewart to the office of Governor of New-York, but lose no time in electing "Birney the Just," that he may speedily and agreeably abolish Slavery.

Such is the brief glance at the present principles of the Liberty Party. How long the party will adhere to these principles, another year, perhaps another month, will bring forth.

Is this party worthy the countenance and support of the people of color in these United States? This question will be the subject of another letter from

Affectionately yours,
J. McCUNE SMITH.

NEW-YORK CITY, Oct. 11th, 1844.

*Notes on Virginia, pp. 266—280. Philad. 1801. These notes were written in 1782—3.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM MR. BIRNEY.

BATAVIA, October 26, 1844.

DEAR SIR:—The statement in the affidavit of W. S. Driggs, that I pledged myself to Mr. J. B. Garland, of Saginaw county, to refrain from agitating the question of abolition in the House, (in the event of my election to the Legislature,) is wholly false. Mr. Garland never proposed such a thing, nor was it ever offered on my part.

Equally false is it that I wrote a letter to Mr Garland, authorizing him to make the above statement, or that I wrote a letter to Mr. G. containing any reference to such a statement. As I never made such a statement to Mr. Garland, and as I believe Mr. Garland to be a man of veracity, I therefore believe that Mr. Driggs has either misunderstood Mr G. or intentionally misrepresented his conversation with him.

The above was my conclusion on first seeing Driggs's affidavit. Yesterday I conversed with Dr. Fitzhugh, a Whig of Livingston county, in this State, (who has just now returned from Saginaw.) Dr. F. told me that Mr. McReynolds, the Indian agent, going to, or returning from, Saginaw city a few days ago, conversed with Mr. Garland in relation to the statement of Driggs, and that Mr. Garland informed him that Driggs's statements were wholly unauthorized by anything he (Garland) had told him. This, Dr. Fitzhugh had from Mr. McReynolds himself.

I have always claimed to be a Democrat, but not a democrat of the stamp of that party which has assumed the name of democratic. I am a democrat after the Declaration of Independence. I believe that Declaration when it asserts that "all men are created equal; that they are entitled to liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Mr. Garland well knows that such is my democracy, and such are the "democratic principles" that I would be always ready to carry out in any public station to which I might be called. That he intended to represent me otherwise, I cannot for a moment believe, especially on the testimony of a person wholly unknown to me, who was especially sent by the Whig party into Saginaw county, to "ascertain the facts and circumstances relative to my nomination."

Very, truly yours, &c.
JAMES G. BIRNEY.

F. C. D. M'Kay, Esq., Warsaw, Wayne co., N. Y.

STILL ANOTHER.

CLEVELAND, Ohio, Nov. 1, 1844.

To the Editor of the Ohio American.

SIR:—I saw at Fairport, a few hours ago, the Painesville Telegraph, a Whig paper, containing a letter, dated September 2 th, and purporting to be written by me, to J. B. GARLAND, of Saginaw county, Michigan. IT IS A FORGERY THROUGHOUT! So, I have no doubt, are the affidavits which accompany it, though they bear the name of *real* persons.

Yours, &c. JAMES G. BIRNEY.

THE LETTER TO MR. GARLAND.

DETROIT, Oct. 31, 1844.

Dr. A. L. Porter—Dear Sir:—In answer to your letter of this date, putting to me certain questions as to my interview with Mr. Garland of Saginaw, relative to Mr. Birney's nomination, I answer as follows:

1st. On what day and time of day did you see Mr. Garland?

I saw him on Monday the 21st instant, at his own house, about 30 miles from Flint, a little after noon, or about 1 o'clock.

2d. What did Mr. Garland say in reference to Mr. Birney's letter and nomination?

He said, in substance, that Mr. Birney had

standing, and could not be guilty of the duplicity incident to a publication of the letter at the very moment he was refusing its production to any individual on the ground of sacred obligation.

3d. Q. Does the published letter of Mr. Birney accord with the statement given by Mr. Garland?

It does not: on the contrary it conflicts with it, most directly too, in every essential point.

Your obedient servant,
ANDREW T. M'REYNOLDS.

CHEAP JIMMY'S OPINION ON ABOLITION.

Extract from a pamphlet issued at Tammany Hall, New-York.

The Abolitionists are a class of politicians who, I believe, a great many do not understand their principles. Some suppose them to be a set of beings who are ready and willing at any time to sacrifice all honorable principles, disdain all laws and trample, under foot our sacred Constitution, to accomplish the most trivial circumstance, that will have a tendency to achieve an amelioration of the condition of Slavery. But from what I have learned, by conversing with some of the well-informed portion of them, I almost invariably have found them to speak of our laws, our Constitution, and the sovereignty of our Slave States, to control the destiny of slaves themselves, with as much veneration as any other set of men; they have admitted that there are men among them who do not fully understand the nature and condition of Slavery, who have gone to extremes. This, I believe, has often been caused by having the condition of the slaves in many instances, so falsely represented. I have travelled among them myself in several States; having access to them in all of their cabins, and seeing precisely the condition they are in, and how happy many are situated; then seeing the condition they are represented to be in by some of the Abolition papers, it would surprise me where their information could come from. The actual fact is, I have found the slaves in the South, in many instances, in far better condition than many of the poor operatives in our large factories. Cheap Jimmy's opinion of Abolition is, that I am opposed to Slavery extending any more over our land, and render unto the Slave States all honorable ways and means that we can, to have the condition of the slaves ameliorated; for well I am aware, to emancipate Slavery in some States with haste, would bring more wretchedness than happiness on the poor beings. I have heard many a planter say, that could he set his slaves free, he would be happy, he would be glad to do so; but that his slaves would prefer remaining in Slavery here in preference to being sent to Liberia, which is the only alternative they have, if set free; for there is not, I believe, a single Slave State, but which has a positive law forbidding any slave to be set free, unless they are taken out of the State; and also, a positive law forbidding a free colored person to come from any other State. Thus, you see, there is no mode whereby they can possibly be liberated at present, without there is a home provided for them out of the limits of the Slave States; and when I saw the project of annexing Texas to this country, I thought there might be a great scheme devised to colonize them throughout Texas. As I have said before, in my opinions of Henry Clay, there is no doubt, if Texas was annexed to the United States, that it would all be free States. There is no class of operatives more desirable in agriculture than free blacks; the climate being congenial to their constitution, it would be one of the most desirable places that I see we may possibly ever expect to obtain for them. I formed an opinion, that, as soon as I heard of the project of annexing Texas, what a grand scheme might be projected to colonize the slaves there. The immigration of the white population would be, probably, four times as rapid as we possibly might expect to make the free blacks; which would create no more free blacks than would be actually necessary for useful operatives. If this project was once put in operation, I am confident that there would be subscriptions raised among the abolition societies, sufficient to carry it on with great rapidity, not only to remove such slaves as might be manumitted, but I believe that there could be large amounts raised to purchase slaves of their masters to migrate them to Texas. From the immense quantity of inhabitants Texas is capable of containing, we might, probably, at no great future day, be able to thin the slaves sufficient that the balance might be liberated at home through the same manner as they were in the other States. The small quantity of slaves that are now in Texas, I believe, could be purchased and set free by subscriptions among the societies; and as the free labor could be obtained on better terms, and to more advantage to the planters, than it would be to take slaves there, we need not apprehend any disposition on their part to oppose such a scheme. This project may appear a great, and a wild scheme, but there is no calculating what amount could be raised in the United States to ameliorate the condition of Slavery, where they could be confident of success.

For my part, notwithstanding what little I have worked hard for, I should be willing to contribute liberally to such a project, and I have been surprised that there was none of the leading Abolitionists proposed some scheme like this, if not on so extensive a scale. Had Clay and his party, who rejected the treaty, for the purpose of baiting the Abolitionists, proposed some scheme like this, he might have hooked them; but the coons, I plainly see, are no go for the Abolitionists. On Monday I shall come out with a piece entitled, "Cheap Jimmy's Opinion on the November Coon Skinning Frolic"—this will be a rich piece for the Whigs to read.

JAMES SUYDAM, 251 Grand street.

Who will subscribe for this benevolent and eminently Christian project?—Ed.

From the Free Labor Advocate

INDIANA YEARLY MEETING.

WAYNE COUNTY, IA. 10th mo. 13, 1844.

FRIEND STANTON:—Knowing as I do, that the movements of ecclesiastical bodies on the subject of Slavery, are interesting to all the lovers of freedom; and knowing, furthermore, that the Society of Friends in Indiana stand before the world as being opposed to the Anti-Slavery enterprise, I think the action of the last Yearly meeting on the subject, may, with propriety, be spread before the readers of the Advocate. And let me say here, that I shall endeavor to tell the whole story, both pro and con, "without concealment, without compromise." And for fear any should think that I wish to show the darkest side of the picture, I will at the commencement give it as my opinion that the Yearly meeting is on the advance in the Anti-Slavery cause.

The appearance of James C. Fuller made no little stir. As a sample of the cold reception which he met with, I will relate the following: A few minutes after his arrival on the Fifth-day morning, he observed an individual who appeared to be pointing him (Fuller) out to some persons with whom he was evidently conversing. James said he thought he had seen him, and on hearing his name, immediately added, that he had been at his house when once on a journey to the East, and that he had taken him thirty-five miles on his journey. And notwithstanding James was in a land of strangers; and may I not say, enemies too, the Friend alluded to, did not so much as speak to him, unless he did it on one of the last two days of the meeting. He was appointed to one of the highest offices in Society the following day. Another active Friend being asked if Fuller was a minister, replied with great emphasis, "NO, HE IS NOTHING BUT AN ABOLITION LECTURER." The moment his voice was heard in the meeting all eyes were turned towards him with an earnestness that none but an "abolition lecturer" could have commanded.

An excellent document issued by London Yearly meeting was read, and very fully united with, and ten thousand copies ordered to be printed, five thousand for the members of Society, and the other five for general distribution. One aged minister, whose name I can hardly forbear to mention, wanted a large number circulated in the slave States. The document alluded to, has been published in the National Anti-Slavery Standard, and so far as I know, universally considered genuine Anti-Slavery. After it was read, J. Pease, from England, preached what I shall pronounce a good Anti-Slavery Sermon; at least some of his remarks were well suited to some of his hearers; and I cannot see how any could unite with what he said, and vote for Henry Clay, unless it is by taking the ground, that a Friend did, with whom I conversed, that he (Clay) is an Abolitionist!

Why it is that J. C. Fuller should make such a stir, and be treated with such cold indifference, not to say contempt, by the same meeting that could so fully approve of the document from London Yearly meeting, is a matter with which I have been somewhat puzzled, and which, at present, I shall not undertake to decide. He produced a minute from his Monthly meeting, which is a branch of New-York Yearly meeting, and that meeting corresponds with London Yearly meeting, from which the address spoken of, issued, and the very individuals that put it before the world, were the leaders in the World's Convention, which was attended by a large number of the most prominent Abolitionists of the United States, and among them James C. Fuller, of Skaneateles, New-York, who took an active part in its proceedings.

I stated that I considered the meeting on the advance in the Anti-Slavery cause, and the following circumstance, I think, proves it. Some of the Quarters, in the eighth answer, reported, that some of their members did not bear a faithful testimony against Slavery, and if I am not very much mistaken, the deficiency was engrafted into the summary, or general answer, whereas, in 1841, when a deficiency of the kind was reported, it was stricken out, and the answer made to read, "Friends bear a testimony against Slavery as far as appears." I believe there is a large number of Friends in the Yearly meeting who are, decidedly, Abolitionists, but there are a considerable number for whom I have no hope. I shall expect to see Calhoun, McDuffee, Clay, and Polk, enlisting in the Anti-Slavery cause, as soon as they. They have set their faces against the enterprise, and are determined to oppose it.

The Epistles to the Yearly meetings, as I believe, mentioned the subject, and some of them spoke of it extensively. Some of them mentioned the fact, that a portion of the committee on the concerns of the people of color had aided in rescuing fourteen individuals from Slavery. The circumstances of the case are these. A slaveholder in Missouri, dying, willed fourteen of his slaves to a Friend in New-England, who, of course, would endeavor to emancipate them, and the committee had aided in procuring for them papers of manumission.

Some of the Epistles also mentioned the fact that the Meeting for Sufferings had memorialized Congress against the admission of Texas. This was, I thought, "puffing small matters into great consequence." For fear all may not know the circumstances of this case, I will state them. After Tyler's abominable treaty had been written, and the fact that it was about to be presented to the Senate, published all over the United States, the Meeting for Sufferings was called together, and a memorial prepared and sent to Congress, against its ratification; so the treaty had been before the Senate, and was rejected, before the memorial reached there, as all sensible persons must have expected. The subject of again memorializing Congress against the admission of Texas, if way should open, was referred to the Meeting for Sufferings. I might state, that nothing was said, either against voting for slaveholders, or purchasing the product of slave labor, to my knowledge.

In placing the acts of the Yearly meeting before the public, I have endeavored to show them in their true light, at least I do not wish to make them appear worse than they really are; for I not only desire to see Indiana Yearly Meeting, but all the church organizations in the world, warmly enlisting on the side of the oppressed. Thine, in the cause of freedom,
R. T. REED.

Communications.

LETTER TO GERRIT SMITH, Esq'r.

MY DEAR FRIEND.—I thank you for your kindness in sending me a copy of your "Constitutional argument against American Slavery." I have endeavored to examine it impartially, with a desire to know, and advocate the truth. If I cannot accord with you, it certainly is not because my judgment is biassed by long-cherished opinion, for it is but recently that my mind, in consequence of a critical examination of the Constitution, has been established in the belief, that no man can, consistently with righteousness, engage to support it. Of the propriety of civil Government, and of its recognition in the Word of the Lord, as "an ordinance of God," "for good," I have no doubt. I regret the existence of an insuperable barrier to my uniting with the friends of the slave, in what appears to me a very appropriate mean for the attainment of our benevolent object. By the force of truth I am driven to my present position.

What is the issue between us? Is it, whether or not the Constitution contains *any* excellent principles? Is it whether or not many of its provisions are in perfect harmony with the design avowed in the preamble, "*to establish justice?*" No, my dear brother. The question is, whether or not, *any* of its provisions are a violation of that design? The more the just provisions exceed the unjust, the more are the latter condemned. The more odious do they appear to the moral sense in the contrast. If it contains one provision "to establish justice," and one to establish injustice, then justice and injustice are there in equilibrium. If it contains two for the former, and one for the latter then is the latter doubly condemned. All the excellencies of the document, which you present, to gain my approbation of it, must, if I love those excellencies, confirm my abhorrence of those provisions in it, which are of a contrary nature. The more you convince me of the importance of aiding in maintaining those provisions which tend "to establish justice," the more you convince me of the importance of refusing all sanction to those which pervert it.

You ask, "Why should we regard the Federal Constitution as pro-slavery?" The Constitution itself shall answer this question. "The migration or importation of such persons, as any of the States now existing, shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight; but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person." To attempt to prove to you that the generally admitted construction of this clause is the correct one, would seem to be a work of supererogation, for p. 9 you remark, "The provision respecting the African slave-trade, (for, I admit, that, if not exclusively, it, nevertheless, respects that,) is to be regarded as Anti-Slavery, because it is a part of an Anti-Slavery agreement." Alas! for the poor slave, if this is anti-slavery! Well may he exclaim, "Save me from my friends." The vilest traffic which ever cursed the earth—a trade, which, independently of all its horrible concomitants, is an atrocious robbery of all human rights—a trade conected with the burning of villages, the murder of infants, and of the aged, the most cruel sufferings and suffocation to death in the slave ship, the rending asunder of all the endearing ties of humanity, now acknowledged by that very Congress, to be piracy; positively shall not be prohibited "for nineteen years, and (for anything that appears in the Constitution) may be continued by the States until doomsday. Then, to crown the whole, with a searing of conscience which the crucifiers of the Lord of glory, never possessed, "the price of blood" was to be cast into the National Treasury; and all this "is a part of an Anti-Slavery agreement' !!!

Ah! my beloved brother, review the subject and tell me, is this "to establish justice?" Is this the appropriate decree of the "Goddess of Liberty"? What violation of human rights, in the name of outraged humanity, I ask, could all the despots of the earth perpetrate more heinous than this? What a spectacle presented to God and the universe! Men, just delivered from the galling yoke of oppression, confessing to the Almighty that Liberty is his own inalienable gift to ALL men, and, with the same breath, assuring him, that the vile and infamous traffic in the souls he has made, shall not be prohibited for nineteen years!

What is your argument to prove that this is "a part of an Anti-Slavery agreement"? It is that, "But, for the qualification of the power by the provision, the power would not have been granted." i. e. if Congress would not have agreed to sanction the vile traffic for nineteen years, the States would not have delegated to it the power of ever prohibiting it. I ask you, in the name of righteousness and humanity, if the framers and adopters of the Constitution had a moral right to make such a contract? Had they authority to license the perpetration of the vilest outrage on humanity for nineteen years, for the sake of then obtaining power to prohibit it? Had they the right to do evil nineteen years, that good might come in the twentieth?

You will have the kindness to review your illustration of the partnership. The question is not *what the States might individually do*, but what did *the framers of the Constitution do* in reference to this abominable traffic. Permit me to ask, did they not, by positively prohibiting its abolition by Congress, for nineteen years, agree to its continuance for that period? Could any State prohibit it before that time, without violating the Constitution? Whether they could or not, the fact remains, that the Constitution sanctions its continuance until that time. You remark, "I enter into a partnership, mercantile or other, with a man who is a drunkard, and I obtain from him a written stipulation, that he will drink no more intoxicating liquor after six months; and that should he, I may resort even to force itself to restrain his indulgence." But suppose (as you must to make the cases parallel) that you enter into an engagement with him that he shall not be prevented from drinking as much as he pleases for the "six months," can you, in truth, say, that such a stipulation does not make you responsible for his continued intemperance?" All that can be said in favor of the clause, under consideration, is, that it seems to imply a power to prohibit the trade after eighteen hundred and eight. The States gave no "written stipulation" to that effect, neither does the clause contain a syllable of assurance that it should be done. If the States had given such a stipulation, it would have given no powers under heaven the authority to sanction the continuance of the abomination a single moment. The commandment of the Infinite, to cease to do evil, creates an *immediate* obligation. It is binding now and forever. God never gave the framers of the Constitution authority to suspend their obedience to it for nineteen years, in order to carry out their notions of expediency.

You further remark, that its "operation has long since ceased." I cannot admit that its evil influence has ceased, "It may still be appealed to by those who are yet engaged in the vile traffic, as a matter, though now declared to be piracy, to have been considered as lawful by men of high reputation. Be this, however, as it may, there it stands, in its own pre-eminent deformity, in your "beautiful Temple," blackening the face of your "Goddess of Liberty, standing in the porch," proclaiming to the world, the damning fact, that a nation protesting against the *lightest* yoke of oppression on their own necks, were ready and willing to put the *heaviest* on those of others.

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons." Who can the "*other* persons," contrasted with "*free* persons" be but slaves? Apprentices under age cannot be intended, for they are expressly included in the free persons, as those "bound to service for a term of years." Your own remarks imply the manifest truth, which is universally admitted, and which is indeed demonstrated by subsequent practice, viz: that by "other persons" slaves are designated. On what other foundation, I ask, can the South sustain its claim to number three-fifths of its slaves? You say, "I complain of the provision in question for its *unmanning* process." You complain also of "this three-fifthing of the man who has fallen under the yoke of Slavery." How, then, can it be doubted that the clause is a recognition of Slavery? If this provision is to be considered "a bounty on liberty," because it presents "a strong inducement to every State to raise its inhabitants to the rank of freemen," may you not say the same of other elements of the system of iniquity, on which the blast of the Almighty rests, calling loudly to the guilty usurpers to "let the oppressed go free." Be this, however, as it may, your concession, that the clause requires an "*unmanning* process," is itself sufficient to condemn it, and to deter every friend to humanity from subscribing to it.

Let us now candidly review the clause relative to "insurrections," &c. The Declaration of Independence affirms, that, "when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably, the same object, evinces a design to reduce them (men) under absolute despotism, *it is their right, it is their* DUTY, to throw off such Government, and to provide new guards for their future security." Now, if British tyranny over the colonies justified insurrection, must not the vastly greater tyranny of the United States over the colored race, justify it also? If the "duty" of resistance to despotism, is to be estimated by the degrees of that despotism, how imperious must be the duty of the outraged colored men to resist even unto blood? I am not expressing my own sentiments, but those of the Declaration of Independence. I affirm that the principles proclaimed to the world in that admired document, required an exception to be made in favor of the slaves in the article on insurrections. As none is made, the article is of a pro-slavery character, and requires Mr. Birney, should he be elected President, to employ all the bayonets of the land, if necessary, to murder men for doing what the Declaration of Independence affirms to be "their DUTY." I appeal to your own good judgment to determine, whether, according to that instrument, the provision in the Constitution on the subject of insurrections, stands in "the way of the lawless" or lawful abolition of Slavery. Of all "the long trains of abuses and usurpations, pursuing, invariably, the same object," "to reduce (men) under absolute despotism," which have cursed the earth since the creation, Slavery, "the sum of all villanies," blackens the historic page with its own unrivalled claim to a detestable pre-eminence.

One step more, my dear brother, we must take into your "noble and beautiful Temple of Liberty."

"No person, held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

"*Under the laws thereof.*" You will admit that some of these laws are *slave* laws, which make it a crime to escape from Slavery. The article makes no exception in respect to laws. What, then, is its unavoidable construction? Most certainly it is, that it requires the return of the fugitive slave, as clearly as if the words fugitive slave had been used. This intention is expressed by *necessary* implication. Mr. Birney cannot be elected to the Presidency, until he shall swear or affirm, that if two millions and a half of outraged men, women, and children, should escape from unrighteous and cruel bondage, he will, "to the best of (his) ability," return them, to endure again the indescribable woes of Slavery. He may exclaim, "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?" He must do it, or violate his oath. He has no other alternative. So, if but one escapes, or if not a single case should occur, he engages to aid in robbing his brother of his liberty, if occasion offers, which is itself an iniquitious engagement, whether occasion offers or not. It is a violation of the divine command to "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." An engagement to do wrong is itself wrong doing, although we may never be able to fulfill it.

You admit, (p. 12,) that "one, and the leading one, of the objects, in bringing this provision into the Constitution was, *to facilitate the retaking of fugitive slaves.*" How, then, my dear Sir, could you affirm (p. 15) that this provision is to be construed, as having no reference to slaves." How could you affirm that this was the leading object of the provision, if the provision has "no reference to slaves?" This is a problem of no easy solution.

What is it that blasts the hope of the fugitive, when, by the light of the Star of the North, he presses on to Victoria's land of the free? What, I ask, but this clause of the Constitution, of "free and independent" Columbia? What is it that delivers him over to the tormentors, in defiance of the mandate of high heaven, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee, he shall dwell with thee," &c.? What but this stern decree issuing from your "noble and beautiful Temple of Liberty?" Oh! the diabolical power of this single item of oppression. How many benevolent hands, extended to deliver the oppressed from the horrible pit, has it paralyzed! How many hearts, beating high with freedom's hopes has it filled with anguish and driven down to despair. What boots it, that the instrument is unpolluted by the words "*slave* and *slavery*," while it is polluted with a requisition, which those words could render no more effective, to annihilate the hope and the right of the unhappy fugitive?

You think that it is absurd to "predicate indebtedness of a slave," who, by the slave code, is "a chattel." Suppose it is, is either the absurdity or injustice of the thing, any proof that the words, "person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof," has no reference to the slave? Under the hammer of the auctioneer he is as a chattel, in some other position he is recognized as a person.

You quote, with approbation, the remark, "Congress can no more make a slave than a King." Is it not a matter of fact, that Congress does make slaves? Are not innocent freemen seized in the District, over which Congress *has exclusive jurisdiction*, incarcerated in the dungeons of the nation, and afterward sold into Slavery?

With all this evidence before me, I affirm, without doubt or wavering, that the Constiution is a pro-slavery document; subverting the most righteous principle of the Declaration of Independence, and the immutable law of love, by which the great and glorious Author of our being requires all our intercourse shall be regulated. It presents the affecting and lamentable spectacle of a nation emerging from the thraldom of oppression, to sacrifice all the rights of millions of their brethren on the altar of their own selfishness. May Heaven grant repentance and forgive the deed.

As the Constitution sanctions and requires unrighteous acts, no man can engage to maintain it, without engaging to maintain unrighteousness. As it requires that the innocent fugitive should be cast again into the jaws of the monster, no Abolitionist can subscribe to it, without making himself a transgressor, by building again the things which he has destroyed. If he imagines he can do it *with mental reservation*, he deceives, and is not to be trusted, adopting a principle which nullifies all contracts. If he does it with an intention to do good, after having done the evil, on the principle that the ends sanctifies the means, then he violates God's law, which forbids him to do evil that good may come. If he does it on the principle that political action is a duty, and that he cannot act politically without doing it, he mistakes his duty, and acts on a false principle. If he cannot act politically without engaging to do evil, it is his duty not to act politically at all. The duty to do right and to refuse to do wrong, is eternally binding. It is dependent on no circumstances. The duty of political action is not so. It does depend on circumstances.

You propose to "correct, but not to discard," the Constitution. Well, when it is corrected, defend it. But the question is, may you swear or affirm *to-day*, that you will, to the best of (your) ability, preserve, protect, and defend principles or measures which, you *now* see, do "conflict with righteousness," because you intend to denounce them *to-morrow?* If so, then may you sin to-day, because you intend to do right to-morrow.

The preposterous notion that a man may engage to do a thing which he knows to be wrong, because he is not morally bound to fulfill such an engagement, refutes itself. If he intends to fulfill it, it is a guilty intention. If he does not so intend, he is guilty of lying. In either case, he is also guilty of sanctioning what he knows to be wrong. How obtuse must be the moral sense of the man, who needs to be informed, that it is an immoral act, to engage to perform an immoral act!

For an Abolitionist to affirm that he will support the Constitution, with the view of advancing the cause of human rights, is to belie his own principles in order to establish them. Those who advocate such a measure, ought at least to desist from condemning other political parties for adopting unrighteous means to gain their objects.

Let us, then, my much esteemed friend and beloved brother in the Lord, *immediately* "cease to do evil." Let us advocate an amendment of the Constitution, without a single future act of connivance at its unrighteous provisions. Then will we joyfully rally around it, when, in accordance with the mandate of the Most High, and the banner of freedom, which the nation has unfurled to the world, it shall "proclaim LIBERTY throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

Very respectfully and affectionately yours,
HENRY GREW.

THE NON-VOTING THEORY.—No. 3.

I wish to add something to my reply to the article of Wendell Phillips on this subject, as well as some independent thoughts in reference to the question.

The more we examine the position of Mr. Phillips, that an advocate of the non-voting theory may consistently bring suits before our Courts, the more shall we find it untenable. He felt himself oblized, at the outset, to give up the richt to sue women, aliens, and other non-voters, because they had not joined in the appointment of the Court; but he claimed the right, consistently with the doctrine of "No Union with Slaveholders," to sue the *voters* of this country, even while denying his own citizenship, and the jurisdiction of the Courts over himself; and this suing of the voters, he defended, on the ground that, when a man has appointed a keeper over himself, to compel him to pay his debts, he (Mr. P.) may ask that keeper to compel that man to do justice, without thereby recognizing the rightfulness of the relation between them.

Now this is not a correct statement of the case, and the very fact that Mr. Phillips was driven, doubtless unintentionally to an erroneous statement of it, affords a very considerable presumption against the theory itself, in support of which the statement was made.

If Mr. Phillips had been speaking of the overseers of a meeting of Friends, or the officers of some other religions society, his reasoning would have been fair, because those overseers are appointed to compel their own members to do justice to others, yet not to compel others to do justice in return. But the judges and juries of our National and State Courts are not appointed to exercise jurisdiction over the voters alone, and to make those voters do justice to Mr. Phillips, but not Mr. Phillips to do justice to the voters. They are, on the contrary, appointed to have jurisdiction, both for and against all persons residing within the limits of the country. That being the very purport of their commission, I ask with what face Mr. Phillips can sue a slaveholder before them, and yet, when the slaveholder sues him before the same tribunal, deny the rightfulness of the Court itself, and of its jurisdiction over him, on the pretext that he has renounced his citizenship of the country, and that the Court being conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity, can have no rightful jurisdiction over him and other honest non-voters like him?

The Court may well reply, you should have thought of that sooner. This tribunal was appointed to have jurisdiction both ways between you and the slaveholder, and a pre-requisite to the exercise of that jurisdiction, was an oath to support the Constitution, which oath you condemn, together with the Court, for having taken it. You, knowing this fact, brought suit against the slaveholder: he acknowledged your right to do so, and we aided you on the understanding that we were a tribunal recognized by you both, as sufficiently authorized to make you both do justice, and not as a tribunal to operate on one side only. You must either deny or admit our authority. If you deny it, then you were wrong in bringing your suit before us: if you admit it, then you were wrong in objecting to its exercise against yourself, for we have no power to exercise it for one side only: our commission is to aid all alike, and compel all alike to what we think just.

Now, this answer would be perfectly conclusive against Mr. Phillips, whose doctrine is, that a man who acknowledges the rightfulness of any part of the Government of the United States, or the rightfulness of performing the duties of any one of its officers, either in whole or in part, supports what is wrong, inasmuch as a pre-requisite for holding every office, and performing any of its duties, is an oath to support a pro-slavery Constitution.

Suppose, however, that our Courts were such as he has assumed them to be in his argument, viz: Courts appointed, not to compel the non-voters to do justice, but to compel the voters alone. In that case, would he be correct in asserting that consistently with his general theory of morals, he might bring suit against a voter, without in any degree recognizing the rightfulness of the Court's authority? I think not. He alledges that the authority is altogether sinful, because based on an oath to support the Constitution. I alledge that it is innocent, because there is nothing sinful in that part of the Constitution which some of our Courts and Justices of Peace support, as well as for other reasons before stated.

Taking his view of the matter, he deems it wrong to vote for a Judge or a Justice of the Peace, or for another officer to appoint one, because of the oath to be taken: but right to sue before one, after he has been elected by some of the sinners of the land. I hold, on the contrary, that the habitual partaker of the stolen goods is as bad as the thief: that in habitually employing the Judge or Justice to perform duties which he can perform only by virtue of the oath, he does just as wrong, and in fact the same thing in substance, as if he voted himself for the officer that he so employs. By employing him, he ratifies and avails himself of the advantages of the act which his neighbor has committed in voting for the officer.

And I must think that our estimable friend, Francis Jackson, who has resigned the office of Justice of the Peace, not on the ground that any one of its duties was intrinsically sinful, but that they were all rendered sinful together, by the oath to support the Constitution, required as a preliminary to the exercise of the functions of the office—I say, I must think that Mr. Jackson would place himself in a whimsical posture, if he should hereafter call on any Justice of the Peace, either to collect a debt, to arrest a rioter, or to take a deposition, or the acknowledgment of a deed, or other instrument of writing; as he would, also, were he to apply to a Judge for a writ of Habeas Corpus on behalf of a person wrongfully held as a slave. In doing so, he would ask another to do that which he could not conscientiously do himself, which is the very thing that our non-voters most vehemently declaim against, and yet the very thing which Mr. Phillips would do, if he were to bring a suit before any of our judicial tribunals.

I doubt not that a majority of the supporters of the non-voting theory would, if their own interests should require it, either acknowledge a deed before an officer sworn to support the Constitution, or accept one so acknowledged by another person, and cause it to be recorded also by an officer so sworn. Now, what gross inconsistency is this? They condemn the officer for doing the very thing which they ask him to do; for they ask him to do it as a sworn officer, and would not employ him if he had refused to take the oath; and they tell him he ought to resign his office, while at the same breath they bribe him to retain it, by employing him in it, at a lucrative rate of compensation.

I have heard this excuse made for a non-voting theorist's employment of a public officer to take the acknowledgment of a deed, or to record one, viz: that it was not necessary for the officer to take the oath afresh in order to act in each case, and, therefore, the applicant does not ask him to add to the supposed sin which he has committed in taking the oath, and that if he were appointed anew to the office, the non-voter would advise him not to accept, or in other words, not to take the oath. There are two objections to this reasoning: 1st. That so long as the officer acts under the oath already taken, he adheres to the oath; each particular act is done by virtue of it, and it is in substance the same as if he took the oath afresh for each particular act, inasmuch as if he should publicly declare that he did not intend to keep the oath, such declaration would be ground of impeachment and removal. 2d. Although the non-voting theorist should, *in words*, counsel the newly-appointed officer not to take the oath, yet he would, in the louder language of *deeds*, urge him the other way: for he would have demonstrated by his previous conduct, that if the appointee did not take the oath, the non-voter would give him no fees, but if he would take it, he would reward him liberally for it; and if asked whether this would not be the case, he would be oblized, as an honest man, to answer affirmatively.

I will now further point out some fallacies in which I conceive Mr. Phillips to have fallen in relation to the payment of taxes, and in the contrasting of that act with voting. He condemns voting, because he considers it as the appointing of a person to protect Slavery, yet he defends paying direct taxes, as well as duties on imports, although he admits that such payments go to protect Slavery. His reasoning is this: Importing is innocent of itself: after taxation, against my consent, cannot make it wrong. An act of mine, innocent in itself and from right motives, no after act of another's can make a sin. And though I know certainly beforehand that my act, which is abstractedly innocent, will be taken advantage of by another to inflict evil, still I am not bound to abstain. "I shall deliberate whether I shall cease trading and deprive them of the opportunity, or go on and lose my wealth to reform them. *'Tis a question of expediency, not of right,* which my judgment, not my conscience, must settle."

Now, from this code of morality, I totally dissent. I hold that an act which is abstractedly innocent, may become exceedingly sinful, if done with a full knowledge or conviction that another will avail himself of that act to inflict evil: and that when we have this knowledge or conviction, it becomes a question for *conscience*, as well as for judgment, to determine, whether we shall do that act or not.

If I sell my neighbor arsenic, knowing, or fully believing that he intends to poison one of his family, or lend him a fowling-piece, when satisfied that his object is the murder of another neighbor, I become myself a murderer. So, if Mr. Phillips should be convinced that the immediate abolition of Slavery on the one hand, or its long continuance on the other, depended on the question whether he paid a tax to the Government which upholds Slavery, and notwithstanding this conviction, he should import goods that would pay the requisite tax, or if he should pay it to a direct tax-gatherer, instead of concealing his money and going to prison for non-payment, then he would, by that act, become the chief of slaveholders, and among the chief of sinners.

Whoever undertakes to separate judgment from conscience, in deciding upon the morality of actions in general, or to separate the morality of acts from the probable consequences of those acts, does, in my opinion, grossly depart from the reason and conscience which is most natural to man. No one ever did, or ever can make this separation, generally and customarily. He who does it in some particular cases, without an express divine command to regulate him in those particular cases, does so because such separation will favor some of his preconceived dogmas, and in thus departing from his general practice, he becomes a bundle of inconsistencies.

Not less irrational, in my view, is it to assume, as both Mr. Phillips and the editor of the Standard, in his reply to Mr. Bowditch, have, that there is a distinction between morality and expediency, in compulsory regulations. If it be more expedient for my neighbor to drink water than coffee, then it is immoral for me to compel him to drink coffee.

Hence, the idea, broached in the Standard, that if Slavery did not exist, every one, except the non-resistants, could, consistently with the no-voting theory, "support our Government as perfectly in accordance with the principles of justice and morality," is fallacious. If I believed in that theory, I could not support the Government of any State where the Jews are punished for labor on the first day of the week. Nor could I support the Government of Massachusetts, by reason of the property qualifications requisite for office, nor either that or the Government of Rhode Island, by reason of the restrictions on the right of suffrage.

Neither is there more reason in the assumptions of both the gentlemen referred to, that we can excuse ourselves in importing goods and paying duties on the ground of *compulsion*, any more than in voting and taking an oath to support the Constitution. We are not *compelled* to either course, by anything except our regard to expediency and the welfare of our race, and if I suppose that these will be more advanced by voting than by importing or using foreign goods, then I am under stronger compulsion to vote than I am to support Slavery through the duties on imports.

The true guide of action, in all cases where we have not an explicit divine direction, is to take that course which under all the circumstances, we deem best for the welfare of every human being, always remembering to do as we would be done by. This is the principle by which every just man who passes for one of common sense, regulates his conduct in most of the emergencies of life. those who condemn the principle, do themselves usually act upon it.

The editor of the Standard admits, in his notice of Mr. Bowditch's article, that in matters of Government "we have never reached perfection, and never shall." What stronger argument do we need than this admission, to show that we ought always to participate in the Government such as it is, if by such participation we have a reasonable prospect of reforming it. We exist under it by compulsion, and that compulsion justifies us as much in voting, as in paying taxes, bringing suits, or acknowledging and recording deeds through the agency of the Government. E.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, NOV. 14, 1844.

Take Notice.—There is a paper published in this city, called the New-York Standard, and letters and papers intended for us, often get miscarried to that office. Our friends and correspondents will please be sure and direct to us, as the *Anti-Slavery* Standard.

THE RESULT.

The Whig party is routed, "horse, foot, and dragoons." A harder political battle was never fought, and a more complete victory never obtained. Not only is the host vanquished, but they are discomfited, scattered, dispersed, almost annihilated. They will never rally another army composed of the same materials, under the same banners, certainly not under the same leaders, for another Presidential fight. Though there may spring up another party, with another, a higher, and a more definite issue, that of Slavery, it will not be the Whig party. At least we may hope this. For the honor of the American name, for the honor of humanity, we hope that this lesson will not be lost.

We have arrived at a most singular point in the history of our Government and country. An unprejudiced mind, free from party bias and excitement, cannot but see, that in the eyes of the people, the issue of Slavery and Freedom was fairly presented to them in this election. All other questions have been considered as subsidiary to the one great question of Annexation, or non-Annexation—the extension and perpetuation of Slavery, or a refusal to extend its area. And a majority of these seventeen millions have decided calmly, without the benefit of an equivocation, without the virtue of a misunderstanding, without the subterfuge of deception, but calmly, with their eyes open, with their minds enlightened, with the most entire consciousness of the deed they were about to consummate, that so far as it lay in their power, the curse of Slavery should be extended over a vast tract of country, yet unpeopled, and perpetuated over millions yet unborn, for ages yet to come. And this has been done in the name of Democracy,—doneby the party whose watch-word is Freedom—whose governing principle is claimed to be the largest liberty, an undying hatred of all oppression, of every form of tyranny, and of a perfect equality before God, and by his highest law, natural and revealed, of all men, the rich and the poor, the high and the low, the wise and the ignorant, the black and the white. An act of more unblushing hypocrisy, of unhesitating party scoundrelism, of unmitigated national lying, is not recorded on the pages of history. It was reserved for a people who have not yet finished the monuments raised to commemorate the battles fought for Freedom, to forget the position among the nations in which they might have stood, and throwing away the legacy they inherited from the ages, to bind upon themselves, if they can, and upon the ages yet to come, a despotism as galling and degrading as the heart of man ever conceived, or his hand ever executed.

The manner of doing the deed is not less remarkable than the deed itself. The chosen leader of the party, endeared by one victory, and still more by one defeat, in whose final success all their party pride was enlisted, and for whose triumph they had pledged themselves as partisans and as men, was, without a murmur, or at least with murmurs that were only heard in suppressed mutterings, abandoned. He had dared to utter a feeble and ambiguous remonstrance against the darling project of tyranny. Forgetting how faithfully he had done their work before, how basely, at their bidding, he had obeyed their behests, and betrayed whatever love of freedom there might be in him by virtue of his northern birth, the South demanded his sacrifice. It was granted. A man, comparatively obscure, with no shining qualities as a Statesman, and without the slightest claim to political preferment, unknown even by name to thousands who were required to give him their support, was nominated. He knew how to obey; he pledged himself to the protection of Slavery; this was enough. Wise men ridiculed the idea of success under such a leader. But long custom has taught the slave-drivers to calculate very nicely the measure of the patience of their slaves, and they know the exact point to which obedience may be exacted, as well as the means to be used to insure it. The result shows that they did not reckon in vain on the subserviency of their Northern vassals. A little wholesome discipline on those who threatened to be refractory, answered the double purpose of subduing those, and repressing any incipient thought of resistance among the more timid The hope of party triumph, as well as the fear of punishment, quickly stifled the voice of conscience, if it was ever heard; and where every principle of honor, and honesty, and even the virtue of political consistency, forbad obedience, not even a blush of shame was seen. No show of resistance was made, except by a few in whom still lingered some memory of their manhood, and even these, a threatening look, or the crack of the overseers' whip very speedily brought to a sense of their condition. Yet, seeing all this, we could not but place some dependence on the virtue of the people. The South depended on its vice, and their own habit and power of governing, and in this, their latest and most undisguised attempt upon the capabilities of endurance in the North, have achieved their most successful and complete triumph.

But who that is familiar with the history of these States, since the adoption of the present Constitution, can be surprised at this? The people have done no new thing. The South has made no new demand. Master and servant,—tyrant and slave,—has always been the relation between the two sections of the Union; and obedience has been always rigidly demanded on the one side, and readily yielded on the other. We

selves free, and attempted to serve two masters, and the result is, as it always must be in such attempts, we have given our whole heart to the Devil. But heretofore we have made the ignorance of the people, the mantle for their sin. They have rebuked this weak reliance on their moral character at the expense of their understanding, and declared themselves to be as wicked in intention as they have always been in fact. The result of the election is to be regretted for this only, that it destroys whatever lingering hope there might be, that the majority of the people were not, on this question of Slavery, utterly depraved.

The opposing party, the Whigs, have at least this merit, that when the question of Slavery, in its naked deformity, was presented to them, they voted against it. Had they been successful, we might have still believed the people to be not entirely corrupt in intention. True, they have voted now, for men who would have been obedient to the requirements of the slaveholding power, as every administration of the Government always has been, under the Federal Constitution. But let us give credit where we can. They might, and probably would have been, as base as their opponents, under the same temptation. But in this contest, whether because not tempted, or because they are in fact the purer party, they have shown themselves the least corrupt.

As a wilful exhibition, then, of national depravity, the triumph of the Democratic party may be regretted. Excepting for this reason only, we may rejoice in the defeat of the Whigs. If their professions have been as hypocritical, as they have been loud, they can themselves only mourn for unsuccessful knavery. If the mass of the party have been honest in their hatred of Slavery in the future, the lesson which this election teaches, may be of service. The course of events has meted in full measure, strict and impartial justice to their candidate, the aim of whose ambition, and the effort of whose whole life, has been to reach the bauble which has eluded him at the very moment when it seemed within his grasp. His last die is thrown, and come up a blank. And why is this? However it may have been with the mass, enough to change the result, have seen that there was really no difference between the positions of the two candidates. Mr. Clay has again and again committed himself in favor of Slavery. His words were remembered and repeated. He himself was careful to reiterate them. He has his reward. The heaviest retribution that could fall upon the man this side the grave, has fallen upon him.

And now, viewed only in reference to the future, what should be our feeling at the result? For myself, I answer, it is one of heartfelt and unmixed satisfaction. On the single question of Annexation, I do not believe the Whigs were to be trusted. They were pledged to the country to oppose immediate Annexation, and under present circumstances; and giving them the benefit of believing them—the party as a whole—honest in this, their leaders would have found their political life to depend upon their changing these circumstances, and giving to *immediatism* an extension of only eighteen, or four-and-twenty months. I do not doubt that Texas would have been annexed, and the bonds of the Union, and the hands of tyranny, at the same time strengthened. The issue, which in the Providence of God has been raised for the salvation of the slave, and of the nation, would have been lost. Now we meet it fairly. Annexation comes before the people with all its objectionable features. Thousands will oppose it now, even with the certainty of Dissolution, who, bound by party trammels, and deceived by cunning devices, would have consented to the deed. There is at least, a hope that the North will be true to herself, when no room is left for doubt, that she is to be herself enslaved. If there is any virtue in her—if she has any feeling of commiseration for the slave—if there is manliness enough remaining to claim even the name of Liberty for herself—then will she now assert her rights, and end this tyranny under which she has so long labored. But if it may not be so, if she will bend a willing neck to the yoke, better is it to know this also. Let us know where we are. If we are to have Slavery both North and South, let it come, distinct, defined, without palliation, in its own shape, and no longer in the name of Liberty. Let the struggle, which must be, be now, and let the force be counted.—G.

ANTI-SLAVERY CAMPAIGN IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

A great work has been doing since the month of June last in the Granite State, of which the friends of the cause have not been kept advised. A full corps of the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in co-operation with the New Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society, have been engaged in lectures, and conventions in various parts of the State, with the best results. Upwards of ONE HUNDRED MEETINGS AND CONVENTIONS have been held, and permanent traces of the work done, left in each town. The lecturers, being overwhelmed with the heavy duties of each day have sent us no bulletin of the battles they have won. But a recent interview with one of them, makes us feel that a work hardly second in importance to the hundred conventions of last year, has been done, and is now doing, in New Hampshire. A dozen meetings were held in Portsmouth alone, where little anti-slavery labor had been expended; and the town strongly moved by the devotedness and eloquence of Miss Kelley and Miss Hitchcock. Of the noble example and successful labors of the first, there is no need (though it is a pleasure) to speak; for they are known throughout the United States, and appreciated by every Abolitionist. But the friends ought to be informed for their encouragement of the acquisition which the cause has received in Elizabeth Hitchcock. The Abolitionists from New Hampshire speak with very great satisfaction of the aid she has given them. Her clear, calm, logical intellect, combined with the warmth of devoted benevolence, have made the services she has rendered most valuable to the cause. These ladies, with Messrs. Pillsbury, Remond, Douglass, Foster, and Spear, are to return to complete their work in New Hampshire. That State was selected for the field of our operations, as the one which the simoom of political partisanship had not rendered pestilential to the cause. The Democratic party is there so decidedly paramount, that the Whigs have no heart to labor to gain the ascendency, and the Democrats no stimulus in the dread of losing it; and until the rage of electioneering shall have subsided in other States, the agents will continue there. Mr. Foster, with two others, will take the river counties, and Miss Kelley with Miss Hitchcock, and probably Mr. Douglass, will go through Cheshire and Hillsborough counties. All these highly-esteemed fellow-laborers being well known and greatly beloved, there is no need to commend them to the hearts, and to the homes of Abolitionists. Our friend Rogers's health, all who love the cause will rejoice to learn, has somewhat improved.—c.

The following article should have appeared last week, but was omitted for want of room.

NEW BEDFORD CONVENTION.

I had the pleasure of attending the Anti-Slavery Convention, held in New Bedford, on Saturday and Sunday, the 19th and 20th of October. The meetings were held in Liberty Hall, a spacious room, formerly the Unitarian Meeting House, which the friends of freedom, in New Bedford, have purchased and devoted to Free Discussion. A violent storm ushered in, and accompanied the first morning's meeting. The attendance was consequently small, but sufficient to afford materials for an efficient organization of the Convention. Andrew Robeson was appointed its Chairman, and John F. Emerson, and Caroline Weston, its Secretaries. In the afternoon a larger audience was in attendance, and in the evening the Hall was well filled. The general subjects of Slavery, and the case of Walker, Torrey, and the Missouri prisoners, occupied that day. Messrs. Remond and Douglass, and Mr. Turner, a fugitive slave, and others set forth these topics with much power and effect.

The meeting was held in the same place throughout Sunday. The Disunion question—or the duties of Abolitionists towards the existing slaveholding Government—was first taken up. I set forth the doctrine as I understood it at some length. When I had concluded, Mr. Origen Bachelor took the floor in reply. He did not deny the pro-slavery character of the Constitution—on the contrary, he expressed great contempt for the men who attempted to pervert it from its original intention, for selfish and party purposes. But, assuming that civil Government is a Divine Institution, he inferred the duty of taking part in any form of Government, however wicked! In the afternoon, Mr. Douglass gave his views on the subject in a clear and able manner. Having made what Mr. Bachelor conceived to be a slighting remark touching his argument in the morning, he insisted on his right of *restating* and re-enforcing it! Mr. Remond replied, and at the end of the session, the resolutions were passed unanimously.

In the evening, Mr. Remond addressed the crowded audience in a speech of energetic eloquence. The topic for discussion was the pro-slavery character of the three political parties. After Mr. R. had finished, I followed, and gave my views on the subject. Mr. and Mrs. Bearse continued the discussion, and Mr. Douglass concluded it, after which the resolutions passed unanimously. Mr. D's speech was in his happiest vein. He interwove with his argument an account of his arrival in New Bedford, and his early experiences there, and concluded with his Slaveholder's sermon. The meeting adjourned apparently highly gratified with the success that had attended it.

The hospitality of the New Bedford friends was extended in their usual kind and hospitable manner to the friends from other towns. It is a place which the Abolitionist, as well as the fugitive from Slavery, delights to visit. A warm welcome is always extended to the one as to the other. New Bedford is emphatically the City of Refuge of the Southern Slaves. When the fugitive has once planted his foot upon its soil, he feels that he is safe—and not only safe, but secure of kindness. It has something the air of a Southern city from the numbers of colored persons who throng the streets. But there the resemblance ends. There is as wide a difference between the looks of the free colored people of New Bedford, and their brethren yet in bonds, as there is between Slavery and Liberty. Their condition and appearance afford a speaking reply to the doubts which are sometimes expressed of the ability of the blacks to take care of themselves. On Monday morning I took a kind farewell of the beautiful town of New Bedford and its hospitable inhabitants, and returned home, well satisfied with the success of the meeting.—Q.

"NON-VOTING THEORY."

I have neither space nor time, even were it worth either, for an ethical disquisition in answer to "E.'s" ingenious article in another column. Whether Paley's doctrine of expediency,—and I understand E. to adopt this essentially—be right or wrong, it is not necessary, I apprehend, to decide, to settle the question whether I will voluntarily take the oath to support a Constitution which obliges me to suppress a servile Revolution, and return fugitive slaves. If our principle be a correct one, that we ought not to give support to a slaveholding Government, and E. can show that it has a more extended application than we now perceive, I, for one, am open to conviction on those points, and ready to be branded as acting inconsistently with my acknowledged duty, if I do not live up to it. But as I have before said, our inconsistency cannot invalidate the truth of the principle. I am willing to grant, even, that to cease from all direct or indirect support of the Government, I must leave the country, or further yet, to die; but I conceive that my duty to the slave, stops short of either of these steps. Nevertheless, I am bound to do all that, consistently with other duties, I can, to refrain from supporting a pro-slavery Government. Should I, as I go home to-night, see a man drowning in the East river, it is my duty to save him. It does not, however, at all follow, that I am bound to lose my own life in the attempt. Neither does it follow that it is *not* a duty to save drowning men, because, in many cases, we could not do it without sacrificing our own lives, or the lives of others. We act on this principle daily, and without committing a moral wrong. E. himself, I presume, does, when he refrains on principle from the direct fruits of slave labor, and yet uses those fruits indirectly always. Duties never clash; and that ceases to be a duty at the point when it comes in contact with a higher obligation. I have other duties to the slave and to myself, beside that of not supporting the Government. E. then, must show that my duty to take the oath to the Constitution, is paramount to all other obligations: or in other words, he must show that the duty *not* to support the Government up to a given point, continues to be obligatory beyond that point, where another duty, with which it clashes, asserts its obligation, also to be obeyed.

But the question after all, is not so much whether I can refrain from giving support to the Government, or whether, in every possible conceivable case, I should refrain from doing so, but whether I shall voluntarily take an oath to fulfill its requirements which I know to be wrong. In convincing me that I still support the Government indirectly by importing goods, and paying taxes, and sueing my neighbor, he fails to convince me that, therefore, I am bound to return a fugitive slave, or to swear to do it. At best, he can only convict me of an inconsistency in consenting to do a thing innocent in itself—considered apart from its connection with governmental support—and in refusing to do a thing *absolutely wrong* in itself, in every relation. I refrain from giving voluntary support to Government, so far as I can, consistently with my other duties, because it requires me to do that which I know to be wrong. In paying my tax, or swearing to my invoice at the Custom House, I take no oath to put down insurrections, or return fugitive slaves. In casting a ballot, I do both.

E. misconceives, or perverts my meaning, in the last paragraph in his article. I believe we have never reached perfection in any system of Government, and probably never shall, till the race ceases to be human, and becomes divine. We are not, therefore, to continue to act with an immoral Government, where it requires us to do immoral acts, but the reverse. That there may be progress towards perfection—which, also, there must always be—we are to refuse to act with such Governments, and create anew in accordance with our highest ideal at the time. So men have always acted, and overthrown a despotism by establishing a limited monarchy, or a limited monarchy by a Republic—substituting a Government of which they see the evils, by one which they esteem true. We may do it by force of arms, or by moral power. O'Connell and the Repealers are doing it at this moment, by moral power. A majority of the members of the American Society, would do the same thing, in the same way.—G.

JAMES G. BIRNEY.

This gentleman surpasses his *rival* candidate—not for the Michigan Legislature, but for the Presidency—in the number and frequency of his letters. It is difficult to keep the run of them. One of the Liberty Party lecturers said of Mr. Clay, that no honest man would be obliged to write four letters to define his position. I accept the proposition, and leave him and his friends to make the application.

On the first page of to-day's paper will be found *two* more letters from Mr. Birney, and also a letter from the man who told the man who told Mr. Birney, that Mr. Garland didn't tell Mr. Driggs all that the said Driggs said under oath. Long as this chain of evidence is, it is still incomplete, and very unsatisfactory. From the last letter it seems that there is a letter after all from Mr. Birney in Mr. Garland's possession, which he refuses to show. Still another and later letter from Mr. Birney, which came too late for this paper, refers to this Garland letter, and announces his intention of publishing it on his return home. This may perhaps shed some light on this vexed question.

It will be seen that the document which I mentioned last week as a probable forgery, Mr. Birney declares to be such. By whomever perpetrated, it was an infamous proceeding. A letter, however, has also been published in the Michigan State Journal, from H. M. Miller, a Presbyterian minister, of Saginaw, which substantiates the main charge, of a pledge to support Democratic men and measures. This is, altogether, a very curious business, and Mr. Birney seems exceedingly bothered to keep on the scent of the various steps that are taken, and explain them as fast as they are made. The next chapter will probably be Birney on Miller.

KIDNAPPING BY AN ENGLISHMAN.

It is the boast of England that no slave can breathe upon her soil. The Anti-Slavery sentiment is as prevalent among her subjects, as the opposite feeling is in our own country. An act like the following, committed by the captain of a Northern vessel would not surprise us, but it is a source both of grief and surprise when the perpetrator is an Englishman. The English Brig Victoria, a part of whose crew are colored men, from the Island of New Providence, sailed from Key West sometime in October. When a few miles at sea, the captain, whose name is Hudson, discovered on board a fugitive slave, who had been, it is said, enticed away from his master, a Mr. Hutchinson, by some of the crew. The captain immediately ordered the boat to be manned, and returned the slave. The Key West paper, of course, highly commends the captain for this act, and the more especially as he is "from that land of pseudo philanthropists, Great Britain, where to steal a slave from his master, is considered as doing 'God service.'" The vessel was on the high seas, and Captain Hudson, I presume, is amenable to the laws of his country for the crime which he has committed.

SOUTHERN TRADE.

I cut the following advertisement from the Baltimore Clipper, of the 6th instant. If I am rightly informed for what purpose the class designated as "*Fancy Girls*," are wanted, the undisguised wickedness of such an advertisement exceeds all that I had supposed even slave-traders would be guilty of, or any community would countenance, pretending to possess that small share of respectable morality and decency, which is generally found in Southern cities. The Whigs in the late canvass have made much ado about the slave-pen at Washington, over which is raised a flag with the inscription of Polk and Dallas. This Mr. Scotti, in another column of the Clipper, has an advertisement of his other agencies, beside that of slave dealing, and his list of references is headed by the name of Reverdy Johnson, Esq. a Whig member of Congress. What do our Anti-Slavery Whig friends think of their associates?

CASH FOR NEGROES.—I wish to purchase 75 or 100 Negro Slaves for life, of both sexes, from the age of 8 to 25 years, for which I will pay liberal cash prices, for I can at all times be found at General Slave Agency Depot, No. 10, Exchange Place—in my absence at any time, a line left will be attended to immediately on my return.

L. F. SCOTTI.

N. B. I wish particularly to purchase several Seamstresses and likely small FANCY GIRLS for nurses. I will also purchase several families.

Southern Planters would do well to give me a call before they make their purchases.

MORE AFFIDAVITS.

A story is published in the Ohio Statesman, of the confinement of two persons in jail, in Lexington, Kentucky, awaiting their trials on an indictment for "negro stealing." In the document, which purports to be the sworn statement of the jailor in Lexington, these persons are called the Rev. Calvin Fairbank, and Delia A. Webster—the latter said to be a niece of Daniel Webster! That a man named Fairbank has been imprisoned, for enticing slaves away for some purpose, is no doubt true.

☞ When the Liberty Party editors have settled it whether the American Society be Whig or Non-Resistant, it may be better worth while to notice their calumnies. At present their charges disprove each other.

DAVID LEE CHILD, at the request of several gentlemen in Northampton, has written and published in the Northampton papers, a history of the origin of Liberty Party. It is a most able document, and from the writhings of the Emancipator under it, I judge has done great good.

MR. GREW will be satisfied, I think, by glancing at the Standards for several weeks past, that his article has received as early an insertion as justice to others permitted. Letters on local matters lose their interest in a great measure by being delayed; and the writers of electioneering articles would have good ground of complaint, if they were put off till after the election. An essay on the Constitution would, I fear, lose none of its force if delayed a year.

JOSHUA V. HIMES, who has been accused of advising his followers to sacrifice their property, and of appropriating it to his own benefit, has most fully and satisfactorily disproved the charge in the Boston papers.

MR. WEBSTER, in a speech last week in Boston, advocated the principles of the Native American party.

☞ The article on the first page from the Christian Advocate and Journal, the Baltimore Saturday Visiter says, was written by a Baltimorean.

GOV. BOUCK has appointed Thursday, the 12th day of December, as a day of Prayer and Thanksgiving for the people of this State.

ELECTION RETURNS.

FOR CLAY.	FOR POLK.
Rhode Island,	New Hampshire,
Connecticut,	New-York,
New Jersey,	Pennsylvania,
Maryland,	Virginia,
North Carolina,	Michigan,
Ohio.	Georgia.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

MEXICO.

From Mexico.—The New Orleans Picayune of the 23d has later news from Mexico.

We have before us the address of General Canalizo in taking possession of the reins of Government. It is couched in the most general terms, expressive of his anxiety to co-operate with the legislative branches of the Government. The only specific measure urged upon Congress is the prosecution of the war against Texas, for which he asks that the necessary means should be at once raised.

The President of the Senate replied to him in flattering terms. He reciprocated his views upon Texas, and urged him to render effective the force put at the command of the Executive. He expressed himself of the opinion that the sums already voted would be enough for the present exigencies of the army, if rigidly collected, expended without peculation, and applied strictly to the purposes for which they were voted.

From the angry discussion going on in the journals we perceive that the Chambers harmonize little with the ministry and Government. The ministry are boldly accused in the papers of transcending their powers, and the Chambers are called upon to scrutinize the manner in which the funds levied for the Texan campaign are disbursed. The partisans of the ministry reply, that by the organic basis of the Government, the ministry is in no way responsible to the Chambers; that the disbursement of the public funds is altogether an executive function, and that there has been no jobbing on the part of the ministry—that no usurious contracts have been made. The orders given by Santa Anna upon leaving the capital, it is said, were most strict, that not a fraction of the four millions of dollars should be applied to any other object, whatever might be the extremity than the Texan campaign.

NEW MEXICO.

War had broken out between the New Mexicans and the tribes of Eutaw Indians, who live around Taos. Early in September, six of the Eutaw chiefs, accompanied by one hundred warriors, visited Santa Fé to obtain from Gov. Martinez restitution for depredations committed last spring on their people, by a trapping party of Spaniards, in the neighborhood of the Salt Mountain.

The six chiefs being in audience with the Governor in his palace, expressed themselves dissatisfied with the presents offered to them, and the leader attempted to pull the Governor from his seat by the hair—whereupon Martinez, seizing his sabre, killed two of them, and the other four were despatched by the guard, who rushed in.

The hundred warriors, in retreating to their village, massacred twelve Mexicans, and a brisk war between the two nations was anticipated.

TEXAS.

A letter from a citizen of Texas, resident at Shelbyville, to his friend at Charleston, dated on the 20th of September, gives some explanation of the origin of the disturbances which lately prevailed to such an alarming extent in that portion of the new Republic. It will be remembered that the intervention of Pre-ident HOUSTON proved effectual in putting an end to the outrages referred to:

National Intelligencer.

"I have enjoyed tolerable health during the summer, but my mind has been much disturbed by the unprecedented state of affairs in Shelby county. Civil war, with all its horrors, has been raging in this community, numbering about five hundred voters. My pen is inadequate to portray to your imagination the desperate state of things, nor can I pretend at this time to describe to you the rise and progress of this desperate war. It commenced about three years ago, but subsided until within the last six months, when it again broke out with redoubled fury. The citizens of the county are about equally divided into two parties, who are termed *Regulators* and *Moderators*. It is no uncommon sight to see two brothers opposed to each other. The Regulators take it on themselves to regulate the community, and order such individuals as they consider bad characters, to leave the county: the Moderators oppose such measures as illegal. It is pretty much this that has produced such scenes, as I trust in God, I shall never again witness. Two severe battles have been fought within a few days, in which many were killed and wounded. About seven hundred men from the adjoining counties, by order of the President, have made their appearance at the seat of war, and we have again some prospect of peace Every man's interest in this county is seriously affected. I, with many others, have pursued a neutral course; being a public officer, I considered it the proper course, but not always the safest during the excitement."

Important from Texas—if True.—A letter received in this city from Texas, states it as a rumor, that Santa Anna has applied to the Texan Government through the British Consul, for an armistice.—*Charleston Patriot, Oct.* 26.

Emigration to Texas.—It appears that the visit of Prince de Solmes, to Texas, as agent of German emigrating associations, has been attended with the very best results, in giving a very hardy and respectable body of men to that country. We learn that one thousand families are daily expected from Germany, and the agent is in New Orleans to purchase one hundred wagons to transport them to the interior.

From the St. Louis Republican of October 31.

NEWS FROM OREGON AND SANTA FE.

The Western Expositor announces the arrival of Mr. William Gilpin, from Oregon. Mr. Gilpin passed the winter among the American settlements of the Wallamettee, and the adjacent sea-coast, and he describes them as enjoying prosperity when he left them in April last.

The emigrant party of 1843, which he accompanied, arrived at their destination in November last, "after having braved and overcome unparalleled dangers and difficulties from savages, from thirst, from hunger—crossing parched, treeless plains—fierce, angry rivers, and forcing their wagons through a thousand miles of mountains, declared impassible by the most experienced guides and voyagers."

His accession swelled the population of Oregon to upwards of two thousand, and they formed a government, elected officers, established courts, and a record of land titles.

Cattle and stock of all kinds are accumulating, and rapidly increasing under a mild climate and unfailing pastures. Provisions of all kinds are abundant, of the most excellent quality, and moderate prices.

Mr. Gilpin passed the trading fort of Bridger and Vasquez, on the 19th of August. This fort is one hundred miles west of Green River, and exactly half way from Independence to Wallamette.

The American trappers scattered among the mountains, had there collected to meet the emigrants, of last spring, an advanced party of thirty of whom, with their wagons and cattle, passed on the 17th, two days later than the emigration of the preceding year.

Two larger companies behind, under General Gilliam, and Colonel Ford, passed subsequently, and all in good time to reach the settlements before the setting in of the winter.

DOMINGO.

Later from St. Domingo.—By the arrival of the brig Republic, from Port au Prince, Oct. 18th, by the politeness of Captain Hoyt, we have the following: All parts of the Island are quiet. Great preparations are making for the reception of the President, Guerrier, from Cape Haitien, where he has been residing for some months past. A triumphal arch has been erected for him to pass under as he enters the city. The blacks spare neither labor nor expense to testify their regard for him. Markets dull—completely overstocked with American produce; about 7,000 barrels of flour in store, and selling for seventeen dollars (Hayti) per barrel. Coffee scarce—demand small, there being but three foreign vessels in port—four Americans, and one French.—*Tribune.*

A correspondent of the New-York Express, writing from Havana, says, that through the exertions of our Consul, Mr. Campbell, "every citizen confined on the serious charge of being implicated in the late horrid attempt to deluge our island with blood, has, with the exception of Mr. Thompson, been liberated on nominal bail. Mr. Thompson's confinement is continued, because as yet he has not been able to present the slight bonds required, but he will, no doubt, within a few days be again at liberty."

SANDWICH ISLANDS.

By three vessels which arrived in the Columbia, in May last, from Honolulu, accounts were received of great rejoicing in the islands, consequent on the acknowledgment of their independence by the United States and the European powers.

Mr. Record, a young lawyer from New-York city, who accompanied the Oregon emigration of 1843, and passed onward to the islands, had been appointed Attorney General of the Sandwich islands by King Tammeamah.

The other confidential officers of the King are also Americans, as well as the most enterprising planters and merchants of that flourishing little Kingdom.

JANERIO.

By the arrival of the barque St. Joseph, we have advices from Rio to the 16th of September last. Politically the news is important. A correspondent writes:

The latest news from Rio Grande is that the war between Buenos Ayres and Brazil has at length commenced in earnest, and several skirmishes have taken place on the north side of the La Plata, during the march of the Brazilian army toward Montevideo.

The Brazilians will not make so easy a conquest in that quarter as was supposed; they are not as good soldiers, and have not had the experience that the Montevideans have had, besides the blockaded city had received strong reinforcements from the capitol, and all the principal towns in the Argentine Republic.

General Paz has left here for Montevideo; a small detachment left a few days before him, under his special command. He will overtake them before they reach Rio Grande, when they will join a force of 12,000 men, and march immediately for the seat of war.

President Rosas is confined to his palace with the gout, and has become more severe in his orders than ever, he can never become reconciled with any of the northern States of South America; he has declared eternal enmity with them.

The continual difficulties of the country have made hides very scarce; there are at present less than there ever have been. Vessels at all the seaports have been compelled to wait a good while for their full cargoes, and some have sailed without a sufficiency.

Important from Peru.—The following are extracts from letters to which access has been given us by an obliging friend.—*Boston Daily Advertiser.*

"*Lima, Aug.* 14.—The last steamer from the intermedios brought us the news of the total defeat of Gen. Vivanco, by Gen. Castilla, near Arequipa. The former arrived on board the same steamer with the greater part of his officers, as fugitives, and has been exiled by the here-existing Government, which has declared in favor of the Constitution of 1838, and the legal authorities instituted by the same. It is not yet known what course of policy Gen. Castilla will pursue; but as he has always declared himself to be the champion of said Constitution, it is expected he will submit to the legal Vice President proclaimed in Lima. This last political change has been brought about here in all order, and without the least noise. Don Domingo Elias, finding that public opinion was in favor of the said Constitution, himself convoked all the authorities, and resigned the executive power to the party designated by the law to fill the office of Vice President. The Congress is convened for the 9th of December, and we are in hopes it will settle all the disputes among the pretenders, as the nation is quite sick of these continued civil strifes."

"Aug. 19.—In politics there is nothing new. Gen. Castilla has not acceded to the proposals of Don Domingo Elias, for an amicable arrangement, and was preparing to come with his army from Arequipa to Callao, by sea. However, we doubt whether he will be able to do so, and still expect he will, by and by, come to terms with the existing Government, which would tranquilize the country at once, as we have at present no other parties to fear."

General Items.

Getting up Recruits for Barbadoes.—The detachment of the 2d West India regiment, stationed here, has been recruiting from among our native population. The men of that corps are liberated Africans, and it has been deemed advisable to supply the deficiency from the population here, instead of Sierra Leone. To a certain extent the experiment has been successful. The old women are horror struck, however, at the idea of their pickaninies becoming "King's Soldiers." This is the first instance within our knowledge of natives of the Island entering the army.—*Kingston Morning Journal.*

Melancholy.—The following are the names of the officers attached to the United States Cutter Vigilant, supposed to have all perished in the late gale off the harbor of Key West:—

Wm. B. G. Taylor, commander; Wm. G. Taylor, first lieutenant commanding; Mr. Cooper, of Hingham, Massachusetts, second lieutenant, do. There were also attached to her six seamen, and the cook, and cabin-boy, slaves, belonging to Capt. Taylor. Mr. Robert Cooper, one of the Louisiana pilots, and two of the negroes who deserted with the pilot from the Balize, were on board. J. C. Johnson, pilot, belonging to the Vigilant, and Mr. Robert Armistead, of New Orleans, (passenger,) were providentially ashore, and saved. The only persons known to be saved from the wreck, were Michael Driscoll and Henry Hoyt, seamen, picked up at sea in a canoe belonging to the cutter, which they fortunately fell in with while in the water.

The Way to Legislate.—The session of the Vermont Legislature lasted three weeks and a day. The principal acts passed, were, an act providing for a geological survey of the State; an act abolishing the militia system, so far as regards the enrolled militia; an act relating to dealers in spirituous liquors, to Innkeepers, &c.; providing for the election of three commissioners in each county, in the month of January, to have control of the subject of licenses; an act modifying the act of 1842, relative to capital punishment, so that sentence of death should not be executed short of one year, and making it the duty of the Judge to order the execution within three months after the expiration of the year.

O. A. Brownson.—The New England Reporter, a Catholic paper published at Boston, says, that on Sunday last, 20th instant, O. A. Brownson, Esq., was received into the bosom of the Catholic Church. He was baptized and confirmed, by the Right Rev. Dr. Fitzpatrick, the Co-adjutor Bishop of the Diocese. The learned Prelate is said to have made a most beautiful and touching address on the occasion.

Mexican Indemnity Instalments.—The Department of State announces, under date of the 4th inst. that the instalments due on the 30th of April, and 30th of July last, under the Convention between the United States and the Mexican Republic on the 30th of January, 1843, were paid by that Government on the 27th of August last.

Disunion.—The inaugural message of Mr. Slade, the newly elected Whig Governor of Vermont, says:—

"Upon the consummation of the threatened measure, [Annexation,] I do not hesitate to say that it would be the duty of Vermont, to declare her unalterable determination to have no connection with the new Union, thus formed, without her consent, and against her will."

Died.

At Westbury, L. I. on the 1st of 11th month, EDMUND POWELL, in the 60th year of his age.

NOTICES.

REMEMBER THE FAIR!

Donations of money, articles, and of materials of all kinds to be used for the Fair, are asked with confidence of all who feel the slightest interest in the Anti-Slavery enterprise. It is not a sect, but a UNION; not a creed, but a PRINCIPLE; not a party, but a CAUSE. Address of the Committee, 142 Nassau st. New York, Office of the American Anti-Slavery Society; or 25 Cornhill, Boston, Office of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

☞ The LIBERTY BELL, our little Anti-Slavery annual, will be published as usual, at the time of the Fair. All of whom we have promise of contributions for it, either literary or pecuniary, or who feel moved to aid it in either way, are requested to write or send *immediately*, to M. W. Chapman, 39 Summer street, Boston; as only an early preparation can ensure a satisfactory completion. ☞ The names of writers are indispensable.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY.

The annual meeting of the Middlesex County Anti-Slavery Society, will be holden at the Town Hall, in Cambridgeport, on Tuesday, the 26th instant, at 10 o'clock, A. M. and will continue in session during the day and evening. It is hoped that all who feel any interest in the slaves' welfare, or regard the honor and prosperity of their country, will be present.

S. C. WHEELER, *Secretary.*

THE WEYMOUTH ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR

Will be held at the WEYMOUTH LANDING, in Mr. WALES'S HALL, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 19th and 20th of November. The Fair will close on Wednesday evening, 20th, with a MUSICAL ENTERTAINMENT and TEA PARTY. A collection of very attractive, rare, low-priced, useful, and altogether desirable articles will be exhibited. Mr. Garrison and other distinguished friends of the cause will be present.

MARY WESTON,
SARAH. H. COWING, } *Committee.*

STATE CONVEYTION.

Of the N. H. Anti-Slavery Society, to be held at Concord, N. H. Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, Nov. 29th, 30th, and Dec. 1st, 1844.

At a meeting of the board of managers of the New Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society, it was

Voted, That a special meeting of the New Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society be called at Concord, on Friday, Nov. 29th, and continue through Saturday and Sunday.

It is hoped there will be a large gathering of the Abolitionists of New Hampshire and New England, on the occasion, as there will be much business of importance to act upon. Wendell Phillips, Edmund Quincy, Abby Kelley, William Lloyd Garrison, Francis Jackson, Parker Pillsbury, and Jane E. Hitchcock have engaged to be present, and the Convention cannot fail to be one of great interest.

J. H. ELA, *Sec'y.*

CLARKSON ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

A stated meeting of this Society will be held at West-Grove meeting house, on 7th day, the 23d of the 11th month, at 11 o'clock, A. M.

CHAS. HAMBLETON, *Sec'y.*

A stated meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, will be held at half-past three o'clock, P. M., on Thursday, November 14th, at Sarah Douglass's school room.

PHEBE EARLE, *Secretary.*

WESTERN NEW-YORK—NOTICE.

WM. W. BROWN will lecture on American Slavery at

Rochester,	November	25.
Macedon Locks,	"	26.
Farmington,	"	27.
Palmyra,	"	28.
Williamson,	"	29.
Sodus Bay Phalanx,	"	30.

These meetings will be held in the evening. The friends in each place are requested to make the proper arrangements, and give early notice in the neighborhood.

RHODE ISLAND.

The ninth Annual Meeting of the *Rhode Island State Anti-Slavery Society*, will be holden at the "New Mechanics Hall," in "Washington Building," Providence, commencing on Wednesday, November 20th, at 8 o'clock, A. M. and will continue in session two or three days.

The well known friends of the cause, from Boston, Massachusetts, from Concord, New Hampshire, and other places, are expected to be present.

The Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society have made arrangements to furnish refreshments for those attending.

It is confidently expected that this will be a meeting of great interest, as a number of interesting and important questions will come up for its consideration. Let the Abolitionists of Rhode Island be there "*en masse.*" To our friends in other States, we say "*come.*"

In behalf of the Board,

A. PAINE, *Secretary.*

CONVENTIONS! CONVENTIONS!

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, it was resolved to hold a series of Conventions in Eastern Pennsylvania and such parts of Delaware and New-Jersey, as lie adjacent to Philadelphia; and the undersigned were appointed a committee to carry this resolution into effect.

It is proposed to hold conventions in such of the following places, as on further consultation and correspondence, may be found to be most suitable. Radnor Hall, Montgomery county; Attleboro, Falsington, and Pineville, Bucks county; Phœnixville or Charlestown, West Chester, Centreville and Kennett Square, Chester county; Marple and Darby, Delaware county; Wilmington, Delaware State; Salem, Woodbury and Crosswicks, New-Jersey.

Persons residing in the several places here mentioned, who may be willing to co-operate in this effort to advance the cause, are requested to write *without delay* to one of the committee of arrangement, mentioning the time that would be most likely to suit them, and the precise place in which they would prefer the meeting to be held.

It is possible that there may be other places not mentioned in the above list, in which meetings might be held to better advantage; persons having information to this effect, are requested to communicate it at once to the committee.

Pains will be taken to secure the attendance at these meetings, of a sufficient number of good speakers to make them interesting.

LUCRETIA MOTT,
E. M. DAVIS,
MARY GREW,
J. M. McKIM,
Committee of Arrangements.

TO THE ABOLITIONISTS OF EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.

Dear friends and fellow laborers.—With hopeful hearts, we have commenced our preparations for our next annual fair, resolved that it shall be greatly superior to that of the last year. For the accomplishment of this purpose, we are dependent upon you. Will you not give us ample proof that we have not relied upon you in vain? You cannot need that we should offer you incentives to increased diligence and zeal in our common cause. The image of the suffering slave is vividly before your mental vision; and were you in any danger of forgetting the sad living picture, it would be frequently revived by some new odious manifestation of the slave power, or by the presence of the fugitive, crossing, in the haste of terror, your brighter path.

Nor need we present to you arguments in favor of this method of advancing our cause. You are aware that our fairs have been a source of great pecuniary profit, as the reports of the treasurer of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society show. The principal part of the profit derived from them have passed into the treasury of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, of which you are members. In asking your assistance, then, we are but asking you to aid our common cause, through the agencies which you have constituted. You have nobly responded to our calls, in other years. Have you not commenced our second decade with renewed ardor and increased self-sacrifice? Will you not evince it by immediately beginning, with us, preparations for the fair of 1844? Labor, each according to your ability or inclination, to let each do something. All marketable commodities, useful or ornamental, will be gratefully received. If our contributors will send, with their manufactures, a statement of the cost of the materials each, the committee of estimating the labor expended on them, will be careful to prevent any article from being sold at a price below its value. A very large part of the articles sold, yield a *fair profit.* If any of our friends in the country, will come and superintend the sale of their articles, they will be most welcome, and their aid truly valuable.

We are sorry to say that our poultry stall was not as well furnished as usual last year. Will not abolitionists who are preparing produce for their own tables or the market, remember, and give us a practical proof that they remember the physically and spiritually starved slave? Give to him, as God hath given to you, freely, abundantly.

We advise all who intend to work in this department (and what abolitionist in Eastern Pennsylvania does not) so begin at once to do something, and enlist the sympathies and efforts of as many others as possible.

We are sure, dear friends, that none of us will regret having done too much, but we may regret having done too little for the emancipation of two and a half millions of slaves.

On behalf of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society.

Anna M. Hopper,	*Maria M. Davis,*
Mary Grew,	*Emma Parker,*
Sarah McKim,	*Matilda Casey,*
Phebe Earle,	*Taressa Hallowell,*
Huldah Justice,	*Elizabeth J. Neall,*
Susan Dorsey,	*Rebecca Stackhouse,*
Gertrude K. Burleigh,	*Sarah Pugh,*
Harriet Snyder,	*Mary Shaw,*
Margaret Griscom,	*Sarah Dorsey*
Sarah M. Douglass,	*Margaret Jones,*
Harriet D. Purvis,	*Margaretta Forten,*
Hetty Burr,	*Esther Reckless,*
Mary T. Stickney,	*Jannette Jackson,*
Martha T. Carman,	*Elizabeth Carman,*
Mary Earle,	*Lydia Gillingham,*
Sidney Ann Lewis,	*Hannah Lee Stickney,

Poetry.

From a friend's Portfolio.

"FOR BEHOLD THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS WITHIN YOU."

BY H. W. OF PORTLAND.

Pilgrim to the heavenly city,
Groping wildered on thy way;
Seek not for the outward landmark,
List not what the blind guides say.

For long years thou hast been seeking
Some new idol found each day;
All that dazzled, all that glistened,
Lured thee from the truth away.

On the outward world relying,
Earthly treasures thou wouldst keep;
Titled friends and lofty honors
Lull thy higher hopes to sleep.

Thou art stored with worldly wisdom,
All the lore of books is thine;
And within thy stately mansion,
Brightly sparkle wit and wine.

Richly droop the silken curtains,
Round the high and mirrored halls;
And on mossy Russian carpets,
Silently thy proud foot falls.

Not the gentlest winds of heaven
Dare too roughly fan thy brow,
Nor the morning's blessed sunbeams
Tinge thy cheek with ruddy glow.

Yet with all these outward riches,
Has thy heart no void confessed—
Whispering, though each wish be granted,
Still, oh still I am not blessed!

And when happy, careless children,
Lure thee with their winning ways—
Thou hast sighed in vain contrition,
Give me back those golden days.

Hadst thou stooped to learn this lesson,
Faithful teachers—they had told
Thou thy kingdom hadst forsaken,
Thou hast thy own birthright sold.

Thou art heir to vast possessions,
Up, and boldly claim thine own;
Seize thy crown—that waits thy wearing—
Leap at once into thy throne.

Look not to some cloudy mansion,
Midst the planets far away—
Trust not to the distant future,
Let thy Heaven begin to-day.

When the struggling soul hath conquered,—
When the path lies fair and clear—
When thou art prepared for Heaven,
Thou wilt find that Heaven is here.

THE SLAVE OF GUADALOUPE.

BY THOMAS DUNN ENGLISH.

On Point-a-Petre, at Guadaloupe,
The sun in wrath went down;
The clouds, they gathered in a troop,
And formed above the town.

Shrieks rose upon the blinding air,
And wail went wildly round;
Shook lofty trees and blossoms fair,
And quaked the solid ground.

The ocean bubbled in agony,
The waves were lashed and driven;
The fiends below tossed to and fro,
Till earth above was riven.

Through falling roofs and crumbling stone,
Upon that dreadful day,
A wretch whose color 'twas shame to own,
Pursued his God-sent way.

His steps were checked—he heard a shriek,
A mingled shriek and prayer,
That told of Hope, though faint and weak,
New-born from crushed despair.

A weak and wounded man exclaimed,
"See, where my brother lies,
In ruins buried, bruised, and maimed—
Help! bondman, or he dies!

"How! heed ye not!—see, here I hold
Man's key to happiness;
'Tis yours—this bright and ruddy gold—
But aid him in his stress."

The white man's gold was bright to see,
Yet spurned he back the clod—
"Nothing for money to-day," said he,
"But all for the love of God."

Oh! speech sublime for man to make,
Far let the words be told;
He'd risk his life for God's own sake,
But not for love of gold.

Though dark his skin, his heart was white,
And those who soar above,
Shall see his spirit robed in light,
Before the throne of Love.

How thrills my inner soul to know,
A slave—of all abhorred—
Though bond in view of all below,
Is free in CHRIST our LORD.

From Blackwood's Magazine.

MY FRIEND.

Wouldst thou be friend of mine?
Thou must be quick and bold
When the right is to be done,
And the truth is to be told;

Wearing no friend-like smile
When thine heart is hot within,
Making no truce with fraud or guile,
No compromise with sin.

Open of eye and speech,
Open of heart and hand,
Holding thine own but as in trust
For thy great brother-band.

Patient and stout to bear,
Yet bearing not forever;
Gentle to rule, and slow to bind,
Like lightning to deliver!

True to thy fatherland,
True to thine own true love;
True to thine altar and thy creed,
And thy good God above.

But with no bigot scorn
For faith sincere as thine,
Though less of form attend the prayer,
Or more of pomp the shrine;

Remembering Him who spake
The word that cannot lie,
"Where two or three in my name meet
There in the midst am I!"

I bar thee not from faults,
God wot, it were in vain!
Inalienable heritage
Since that primeval stain!

The wisest have been fools;
The surest stumbled sore:
Strive thou to stand,—or fall'n arise,
I ask thee not for more!

This do, and thou shalt knit
Closely my heart to thine;
Next thy dear love of God above,
Such friend on earth be mine!

Miscellany.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

TRENTON FALLS.

These falls are on West Canada creek, and are formed by its passage over the rocks of a ridge of high hills. The first thing presented in passing along the road, is a fall of about ten feet, just at the village;—several mills are built upon the site, the forest is cleared away, there are no high hills, no precipitous rocky banks to the stream; it is an ordinary cascade, and we pass along without stopping to look,—we don't think of *that* being "*Trenton Falls*," but a mere ordinary, business-looking, natural mill-dam. We pass on up a beautiful road, with rows of trees on both sides, to the Falls-House, a fine building, situated in a beautiful natural grove; here the road ends—we enter the grove, and taking one of the "well-trodden paths," proceed to the top of a high rocky bluff. There *I* came to a standstill!—right below me lay the stream! silent, still, and dark almost in appearance as ink. White foam was floating on the surface; there lay the waters! down, deep down in a rocky chasm with perpendicular walls. That water seemed to me like a human soul that had been dashed down precipices, against walls of rock, hither, thither, hemmed in, encompassed round with hard, cold prison-walls; down, dashing, driven along, deep, deeper, where the sunshine never comes; no gentleness, no kindness, no aid, no *love*; but driven on irresistably, down, down, further, deeper, madly forced along, raging with fury, and dashed into foam. And then comes the *gulf*. There are high rocky walls, around, below; no chance to sink down, no hope to mount upwards, there *seems* no way of escape,—and dark, gloomy, sullen *despair*, settles down in voiceless agony. Such were the thoughts that the spirit of the gloomy waters carried to my soul. It was *so like* the condition of *many* a human brother. Shall we not work to raise them from their wo? I passed down one flight of steps after another, down the steep bank, until I reached the rocky floor of the stream. Then what a sight! I stood in a deep chasm; high perpendicular rocks on either side; at my feet were the dark gloomy waters; and then, above, they came dashing, and tumbling, and roaring; rushing madly along, where, for thousands of years these rocks have been wearing by their force into this deep chasm. Oh, it was glorious! I pass on up the stream. Sometimes on the smooth rock where the waters dash along when the current is full, and then again treading carefully along dizzy ledges, holding to chains fastened to the rocks, while the waters are dashing furiously in the deep chasm beneath. Then came another scene! A battlement of perpendicular rocks, forty feet high, reaches across the whole visible chasm; and yet, with the exception of some small beautiful cascades, there is no water to be seen falling over the wall. Where is the stream? I go higher up, and there I see it all. There is a bend, and an offset in the chasm: a bend in the stream has for ages been wearing away one of the high rocky walls, and there concealed from all but a close view, comes down the whole stream in one leap, whirling and boiling, in a kind of basin below. And now I climb up on a ledge of rock on the edge of this foaming cauldron, holding on to the chain, and not daring to look down at the foaming waters beneath my feet. Then come smaller falls and rapids—and I go on up the stream. All the way, on both sides, there are high walls of horizontal limestone, fossiliferous rocks; and hills covered with dense forests of hemlock, and arbor-vitæ tower far above, and assume an infinite variety of the grand, majestic, and sublime. Here the pendant branches of the arbor-vitæ, from the trunk standing on the edge of the cliff over my head, reach gracefully down towards the rushing waters, as though entreating them to be calm; like some gentle one, who, with arms of love extended, would restrain the wild impetuosity of a rash, yet beloved spirit, who, amid rocks and whirlpools, had been fretted into foam. There clings the lichen to the wall, and the beautiful fern bends gracefully over it. Yonder, where ten thousand winters have broken down the structure of a softer rock, a green sward has covered the steep surface, and beautiful asters and solidagos are waving in the wind.

Often, very often, I stop to drink into my soul the beauty and the sublimity around me. When I move I look at nothing but the rock on which I tread, for one misstep would hurl me down into the rushing waters beneath;—four persons I understand have thus lost their lives at this place.

I pass on round a rocky angle, and stop. Look! Visiter, if thou hast any love of the terrific-grand, embroidered with transcendent beauty, pause now, and let that scene be daguerreotyped upon the silver tablet of thy soul! There come the waters! Over the rocks see them; down, dashing in wild, furious, jarring, leaps; against, around, and over the confused, irregular rocks: and there, just above, over a wall of fifty feet, comes pouring the whole stream! In one place, where the wall is rather higher, comes a little cascade, white and graceful, singing and dancing as it goes. And there, where the wall is irregular in its front, and yet rather high, comes a thin sheet of white looking water, leaping from ledge to ledge, and then taking the deep plunge. But here, where the wall is not quite so high, goes down the great body of the stream in one bold sweep; and having climbed up the steep rock, enveloped in a cloud of spray, I now stand on the dizzy brink, and look down into the boiling gulf below. How can I describe it? Furious with rage it madly dashes about, up, down, hither, thither, around, and around; heaving, groaning, hissing, roaring, bounding, twisting, sinking down, rising up, and seeming to seek in vain to escape. It is

> "The hell of waters! where they howl and hiss,
> And boil in endless torture!"

Climbing up a wooden stair, another scene bursts on the view. A smaller fall is but a short distance above, and the scenery around enchantingly wild and beautiful. But what is that which *first* strikes the eye on getting to the top of the stair? Is it some bold outline, or jutting crag, or picturesque dash of waters, more grand than anything yet seen? No. Is it some beautiful cottage of a poet, where, with the music of cataracts ever on his ear, and the sublime around, above, below, he could live in a region of enchantment, and feed his soul on angel's food, and breathe forth an ever-varying, high-wrought love-enkindling soul-ennobling stream of song? No. Is it some old gray, ivy-covered castle, high on the cliff, and half covered by the dense evergreen forest, or is it some gothic pile, where, long, long ago, mystic rites were performed, and St. Dennis chanted to the winds? No, it is none of these. It is something more in keeping with the "spirit of the age." It is one of the "*peculiar*" institutions of the times! It is what, after eighteen years of labor, the American Colonization Society, by the united efforts of the churches, and the aid of "this glorious Union," succeeded in furnishing to "poor benighted Africa;" and the intelligence whereof was sounded round and round, through this civilized world, that all might rejoice and "give God the glory," for Africa, poor Africa, was about to be redeemed, for they had—a—*Saw-mill* there!!!

And *here*, in the midst of all this glory, where the heart beats quick in ecstacy; where one would not dream that sordid avarice, would ever *dare* to come—*even* here, some *infamous* Yankee has stuck a *Saw-mill*. I almost wept at the desecration; and the poor "*fallen*" condition of man that *could* have a "soul so dead" as thus to pollute such a spot.

I shall leave the saw-mill, and travel on.—On, amid scenes of wild grandeur: perpendicular rocks and high hills above, and dashing waters beneath. Sometimes walking for a long way under rocks, which shelve out far overhead, and hang heavily, and darkly over the rushing waters, and then down from the edge of the rock hang the long entwined branches of the arbor-vitæ, and form a bower so wild and beautiful, that one feels as though he should like to linger always. But there is more beyond, and we cannot stay. There, is another fall; not so high as some of those below, but beyond expression wild and terrific. The water rushes down a narrow chasm, among, and upon irregular rocks, below; and finding no escape there, it dashes up again, over the rocks, eight or ten feet above the place to which it had fallen, and madly drives along close at one's feet, where we stand on a narrow, broken ledge, where a chain is put up to keep from falling into that terrific place: and even this has not always been successful. A few years ago a young lady from New-York, fell into this dreadful place, and was carried down over several falls and over the main cataract into the foaming whirlpool below, from whence her body was rescued, and a large board, with her name upon it, thrown in it to mark the spot, where, for more than a year I understand, it was whirled round and round before it was carried off by the flood.

A little farther up from the top of a high cliff, which projects far out, and looks, as we gaze up at at, as though it were about to fall and crush you, starts forth a beautiful little crystal spring, and down comes the pure waters more than a hundred feet upon the smooth rock below. What a beautiful natural shower-bath! I felt as though I should dearly like a bath, so went in with my *umbrella* over my head, to *keep from getting wet*, found it quite pleasant! Blessings on the umbrella makers! A little above is another bath of the same character, except that the water does not fall so far: gushing out of the overhanging rock, half way toward its summit.

Still further up, the chasm makes a sudden bend, and the water comes dashing and roaring through a very narrow pass, where the cliff is so near the edge of the water, and the rock so steep and slippery, that no one can pass without imminent danger of instant destruction. Here, therefore, I had to turn and retrace my steps, wondering what glories there might be beyond. On the rock, and walls of a refreshment booth, are carved thousands of names—some had put "of South Carolina," in large letters after their names, as though it were an *honor* to come from a land wet with the blood, and tears of the slave! As an offset to this, I wrote in various places on the rocks, and on the wall, "*No union with Slaveholders!*" Perhaps it may make the knees of some despot smite together, and cause him to tremble like Belshazzer, as he sees this "handwriting on the wall!" After descending again as far as the principle fall, I mounted by a rugged path to the high hill, on the right bank of the stream—a hill covered with dark forests, and carpeted with a thick growth of young evergreens, and broken in every variety of way into high ridges, and deep, dark, and solitary glens. And then, on the very verge of the cliff, what a view! Three falls full in view! How the waters break, and tumble, and roar, far down beneath! What grandeur all around! Who could stand thus and not feel the deepest reverence? Who would not exclaim in his soul, "How wonderous are thy works Lord God Almighty!" E. F.

THE OLD HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Who that has sat in the gallery of the old House of Commons—that venerable building which the calimitous fire of October 16th, 1834, reduced to ashes—can fail to recollect his first feeling of disappointment, as he gazed with a sense of wounded pride around the dark and narrow room, and looked in astonishment at the honorable members grouped in various attitudes of carelessness and indifference? The aspect of the chapel, plain almost to rudeness, appears to have struck an intelligent French stranger with a feeling akin to pity or contempt. "La Salle," he writes, "est petite et sans decoration—point de marbre—point d'or—point de peintures." Its paltry dimensions, confined space, and want of accommodation could only be adequately described in the vernacular of Cobbett, who possessed the peculiar faculty of disenchanting his readers from all charms of poetry, of vulgarizing the noble, and debasing the sublime. "Why," he asks, with the natural indignation of a new member, "are six hundred and fifty-eight of us crammed into a space that allows us no more than half-a-foot square? There we are, crammed into this little hole, squeezing one another, treading upon each others' toes, running about to get a seat, going to the hole at seven in the morning, as I do, to stick a bit of paper with my name on it on a bench, to indicate that I mean to sit there for that day, then routed out of those places again after a division has taken place, and running and scrambling for a seat in just the same manner as people do, when they are let into a dining-room at a public dinner at the Crown and Anchor, or elsewhere." Yet such as it was, "cabin'd and confin'd," undecorated for a century, decked only with a new coat of paint and whitewash, destitute of all architectural pomp, unadorned by a single monument of sculpture or art—into that building what intelligent stranger was ever ushered for the first time without a throbbing heart and heightened pulse! Who but has lowered his voice on first entering that room as he felt the genius of the place compelling awe, the deep inspiration of the past! Mighty memories, sublime associations, breathe their subduing spells around the stranger. *Tanta vis admonitionis inest in locis.* Within those walls the battles of humanity have been fought, the privileges of freedom vindicated, and the liberties of England won. For not less than ten generations, ever since the gentle Edward VI. allotted that consecrated chamber to the great council of Parliament, the genius and virtue, the dignity and rank, the wisdom and eloquence of the nation have been there represented. Treasures of statesmanship have been lavishly poured forth in that hall, which there was no prudent hand to gather. There blushed the chivalry of Raleigh, there wept the servile patriotism of Coke, there recorded its protest the faithful loyalty of Hyde. Its floor was once profaned by the hasty step of the unhappy Charles, who left his guards at the door as he faltered into the Speaker's chair—once far more basely desecrated by the stamp of Cromwell, as he crowded the benches of a truckling assembly with the myrmidons of an usurper. But fearfully was the insult avenged; nobly have those assaults of despotism been requited by acts of freedom—the Habeas Corpus Act, the Bill of Rights, and the Act of Settlement—those death-warrants of tyranny which have since been read there as law. There, with an eye glowing fire, eloquent as his voice, Chatham spoke for immortality, and triumphing over physical weakness and bodily decay, made his very crutch an instrument of oratory—there the great Commoner crushed the house of Bourbon, and smote her power with that electric shock which reverberated to another hemisphere. On that floor the mighty Burke—great even in his failures—threw down the dagger, a specimen of the presents which French fraternity was preparing for his countrymen. There Castlereagh walked proudly up the house amid loud huzzas, with the treaty of peace, signed at Paris, in his hand. There Canning called the new world into existence, that he might redress the balance of the old. By the table in that Chapel, afterwards stained with Percival's blood, the brow of the boldest warrior has grown pale, as he stood up to receive the thanks of the House, and with trembling voice stammered forth his gratitude. Blake, and Albemarle, and Schomberg, Marlborough, and a greater even than that proud captain, the Hero of a Hundred Fights, the Duke of Wellington, have drunk in there the pealing applause which heralded Westminster Abbey. At that bar the proudest of England's peers have bent the head to deprecate the Commons' vengeance; the governors of millions—the ministers of State—have there bowed the knee, and in their impeachment confessed the grandeur of the great national inquest. There the noblest sons of genius—Bacon, and Newton, and Wren, Addison, Gibbon, Mitford, have sat "mute but not inglorious." There Oglethorpe taught the lesson of humanity to inspect our prisons, and Meredith and Romilly pleaded, against capital punishments, that criminals were still men. Those walls have rung with shouts of triumph as the Slave-Trade went down in its iniquity. Peals of laughter have awakened the echoes of that chamber to generations of wits—Martin, and Coventry, Charles Townshend, and Sheridan, and Canning. The hollow murmurs of sympathy have there rung back the funeral tribute to the elder and younger Pitt, to Grenville, and Horner, to that eloquent orator, conspicuous among his countrymen, Grattan, who in his dying hour there poured forth his soul. What exhilarating cheers, the only rewards to St. John, for those lost orations which have perished forever, have there rewarded the efforts of Pitt and Fox, as they sunk back exhausted! The forgotten oratory of that chamber would more than balance all that is recorded. Magnificent as the new building may be, adorned with paintings and embellished with trophies of our progress in the arts, far more convenient than the old chamber, in splendor not to be compared, the palace of senators, and not the mere hall—it can never rival, in the mind's eye, that humbler room empanelled with living memories, blazoned with illustrations of the past. The cloud of light, which filled the old temple with the glory of the Presence, far more than transcended the vivid splendors of the new. Though the rising structure cannot be for centuries what St. Stephens Chapel has been, it will stand, we may rest assured, as the former house, the classical sanctuary of Britain's intellectual greatness, the chosen palladium of her proudest attributes—freedom, and eloquence, and power.—*Townshends History of the House of Commons.*

THE MISSOURI JUDGE.

When Hehner (a prisoner) was brought before the Judge, a violent altercation arose betwixt him and the Attorney, on the propriety of admitting the accused to bail. Authorities were quoted, statutes produced, and the bench was emphatically told that he "could not by law admit him to bail, and that no man that was the very beginning of a lawyer, would say he could." To all this his honor replied, "The court knows well enough what its abawyt, it ain't a-going to do no sich thing as read all them lawbooks, by no manner of means; and it is no use to carry on so, for the courts decides all the pynts agin you."

Having delivered the opinion of the bench with great firmness, his honor now to took a remarkable personal peculiarity he had, which was to gather his lips together when he had made a speech, and suck the air in with great vehemence. No sooner, therefore, was the decision promulgated, than the Attorney sarcastically observed—"Some folks gets their law from books, and some folks, I calculate, must suck it in." This sally having produced a universal titter, his honor immediately arose to vindicate the dignity of the bench, and addressed the following eloquent rebuke to the offending harrister:—"Suck or no suck, I swar I ain't a-going to be bully-ragged by no sich talking, Juniuses as you a sniggering varmint, that's the *non compus mentus* of all human abhorence—that the court's candid opinion—if it ain't, I wish the court may be eternally ——."—*Featherstonhaugh's Slave States.*

From an English paper.

MEYER, THE GREAT PIANIST, IN CONSTANTINOPLE.

Leopold de Meyer spent the summer of last year at Constantinople. He had the pleasure of performing before the "Sultan of the Turkeys." The "Universal Gazette of Augsburgh," has pleasantly recorded the interesting fact:—"The celebrated pianist, Leopold de Meyer," says that universal journal, "had the honor of producing himself in the presence of S. H. the Sultan, under whose sublime nose he was placed on the 19th of this month. (Aug. 1843.) The Chevalier de Schwarzhuber, dragoman to the Austrian *internuncio*, accompanied him for that purpose, on the morning of the said day, to the residence of Rifaat Pacha, by whom he was to be introduced to the Sultan. When they arrived, at the hour appointed, at the country house of Rifaat Pacha, the minister of foreign affairs had them conducted by one of his *tchotadars* to the palace of Beilerbei. The great hall of ceremony, which, from its size and vaulted ceiling, is eminently suited to musical performances, was assigned to De Meyer de Leopold, who accordingly placed his piano there. After he had put everything in readiness, he was shown into a pavilion, situate outside of the seraglio—(judicious precaution—the known gallantry of De Meyer being considered)—where he was requested to wait until the preposterously sublime Sultan should order him into his infinitely impossible presence—which terrific event occurred about two of the clock, in the post-noon. De Meyer and Schwarzhuber were received in the most condescending manner at the entrance of the before mentioned hall, by no less a personage than Riza Pacha, who, after a familiar chat of a quarter of an hour, retired into the inner apartments, to announce to the great grandfather of the fixed stars, that all was ready. In a few minutes his sublimity entered, followed by Riza Pacha, and sundry eunuchs—while from the opposite door entered (fearful to relate!) the three secretaries of the cabinet. The Sultan then disposed himself, netherwise, on an arm-chair which was pight for him on a semicircular platform, turned towards the sea, and raised a foot higher than the floor. Riza Pacha stood at the sublime sides, while the other persons present kept respectfully aloof. At length the grand marshal signified De Meyer, that it was the desire of the too-great-to-be-lightly mentioned, that he should place himself at the clavichord, and play cunning fantasies. Whereupon De Meyer de Leopold extemporised a brilliant prelude, and glided imperceptibly into his *Anna Bolena* fantasy, at the termination of which, the horrid Sultan expressed by a stare, that he was not displeased—and ultimately deigning to remember that he was not dumb, and that the language of sublime looks was not universal, condescended to indicate a wish that De Meyer, the expert pianist, would fiddle for him the Turkish tunes which he (De Meyer, the expert pianist,) had arranged for the piano, and of which the Chevalier de Schwarzhuber had made mention in the conversation he had exulted in with Riza Pacha. Whereupon De Meyer brought down a brace of the most favorite airs (hares,)* of the Sultan which he had hunted up since his arrival in Constantinople, with the aid of the *Maestro di Capella* of His Haughtiness, (Donizotti Bey—brother of the composer, whose works have swamped the civilized world of late years)—and dressed them in such a manner as marvellously suited the palate of the tremendous un-nameable who sat before him. These airs De Meyer has transported to the piana-forte, in-a-not-enough-to-be-wondered-at manner—giving the effect of a complete orchestra, without adding, altering, modifying, or transmuting one iota of the national character of the tunes. The Sultan listened with intense interest, and grimly grinned his satisfaction. He not only conversed furiously with Riza Pacha, but he absolutely asked De Schwarzhuber how and when De Meyer had bagged these airs, (hares,)† and if he, De Schwarzerhuber, had ever tasted them before. After expressing his decided contentment, the Sultan ordered a self-acting barrel-organ, which happened to be in the room, to play several Turkish and other airs—which the organ did, much to the delight of De Meyer. Whereupon the last named asked permission to play a cavalry march, lately composed by him. *Padichah* listened to this with hungry curiosity, and asked many questions of the artist, and especially at what age he had commenced the study of music. The Sultan demanded yet another piece. De Meyer responded by his *Lucia di Lammermoor*, the most brilliant of all brilliant fantasies, which appeared more than all, to captivate "Him of the Turkeys." He arose from his seat, approached the clavichord, curiously and constantly regarded the pianist with an air of much benevolence—following eagerly the roulades, skips, crossings, and other cunning devices with which the fantasy abounds. De Meyer having ended, the Sultan said other pleasantries to him, and jocosely observed that he played better than Donizetti, which, doubtless, that *maestro* would allow. To all of which De Meyer responded with profuse acknowledgments of the honor which had been accorded him. Whereupon Riza Pacha approached him, and presented him on the part of S. H. with a gold snuff-box, garnished with brilliants, as a souvenir—pronouncing the word in Turkish, according to the wish of the Sultan, who, himself, uttered the word several times with emphasis—"*Truzlmdk, Truzlmdk, Truzlmdk!*" De Schwarzhuber also got a gold box from the same quarter—after which His Sublimity quitted the hall. Riza Pacha once more expressed the high satisfaction which the Sultan had received from the playing of the young *virtuoso*, and added these words:—"M. Leopold de Meyer, is decidedly a great artist, and we all know here how to appreciate talent."—*Gazette Universelle d'Augsburgh.*

* This *pun* is litterally traduced from the Augsburgh Journal.

† Again the Augsburgh Journal is guilty—we have stuck to the text.—ED. M. W.

From the London Punch.

THE "GLORIOUS FOURTH OF JULY" IN PHILADELPHIA.

The account has reached us from our (native) American correspondent of the rejoicings which took place at Philadelphia, on the Fourth of last July; the anniversary of that independence which, our correspondent observes, "his forefathers wrested from the proud Britishers, after having licked them with an elegance unparalleled in history."

The Philadelphians appear to have celebrated this day with uncommon splendor; which our correspondent ascribes to the circumstance that they had a double triumph to commemorate: for, as their ancestors, formerly, had burst their bonds in general, so they, recently, had cancelled their own in particular.

We omit all notice of such festivities as are the common attendants on a holyday; and shall record those only which were distinctive of this special occasion.

Pleasure parties were formed in various parts of the city and its neighborhood; also on the Delaware, whereupon floated an immense number of boats, crowded with dense masses of human beings. The greatest harmony, morally speaking, prevailed; although, in a physical sense, this does not seem to have been the case, since patriotic vociferations, intermingled with the discharge of fire-arms, and the hissing and popping of squibs and crackers, resounded on every side: added to which, hundreds of bands were playing, and thousands of people singing different tunes at once—the national anthem of "Yankee Doodle," preponderating over the rest considerably.

Military and civic processions paraded, at intervals, about the city all day, halting from time to time, in front of the different stores, to partake of mint-julap and other refreshments. They bore numerous banners, displaying appropriate legends and devices. The more conspicuous and generally admired were the following:

A collosal head of Liberty, painted on an immense sheet of canvass, her cap adorned with a huge feather, the word "*Repudiation!*" in bronze characters, being inscribed thereon.

A black flag, with a skull and cross-bones depicted on it, and "*No Liquidation!*" in large capitals underneath the same.

A standard, exhibiting an allegorical figure in a garment of drab, meant as a representation of Pennsylvania, one hand clutching a bag of dollars, marked "*Loan!*" the other derisively replied, with a peculiar gesture, to the nose.

Other flags, banners, and placards, of various sizes, stencilled, and painted in different colors, with the sentences, "*We Never Will Refund!*" "*Distrain If You Can!*" "*We Defy Prosecution!*" and many manifestoes of like tendency. There was also an emblem carried about, consisting of a bucket labelled "*Whitewash,*" on the end of a long pole.

At the various dinners, public and private, which took place in the afternoon, speeches of a tone highly moral, with sentiments to match, were delivered in great abundance. A State, it was contended, was an irresponsible abstraction, and amenable to no law whatever of honesty or honor. Liberty of conscience, it was asserted, was an American's birthright; liberty of conscience involved liberty of action; liberty of action rendered payment or non-payment optional. One speaker remarked, in a glow of philanthropy, that the interest of Pennsylvania was now identical with that of the human race, since she had appropriated everybody's principal; and another, unaccustomed to public oratory, contented himself with declaring that, as to the merits of the question, people might say what they liked, but for his part, before he would agree to pay one cent, all he had to say was, he would be hanged—a declaration which was received with unbounded applause. Among the toasts proposed, "Washington and Wipe Out Your Score," "Jefferson and Jockey the Universe," "Duff Green, and Do Your Creditors Brown," may be enumerated.

The day and fireworks went off without any, beyond the average, damage to eyes, apparel, and property; nor does it appear that the numbers lodged in the lock-up houses at night were greater than they have usually been on previous occasions.

REPUBLICANISM IN FRANCE.

There is still a strong party in France in favor of a Republic. Some of the leaders look forward with anxiety to the death of Louis Phillippe, under a belief that a new revolution will then take place. This hope we believe to be chimerical. The King of the French is, undoubtedly, one of the ablest monarchs of the age. He understands his position, and with a farseeing sagacity, he is busily engaged in strengthening the monarchy, with a view to his own retirement, by death or otherwise. Still, the Republicans, and their movements, are not to be treated with contempt. A letter from one of them contains this language:—"By means of the secrect societies, Republicanism has made immense progress in the army—that power upon which tyrants always rely. But if proofs be required in favor of the sincerity with which the French entertain and propagate these free opinions, let attention be for a moment turned to the deeds of the three great days of 18 0. Youths of fourteen and fifteen fell foremost in the ranks of the citizens, uttering shouts in favor of liberty with their last breath. Even the very woman—delicate and timid creatures—became inspired with the glow of Republican ardor. They carried up paving-stones to the roofs of the houses, and hurled them down upon the heads of the royal squadrons; and they bruised charcoal to make gunpowder for the revolutionists. Does not all this denote the sincerity with which Republican ideas are entertained in France? and cannot a people capable of such noble and exalted sentiments, be trusted to model a government for itself? It will be a happy day for France—and for the example of Europe—when the conduct of the French people shall be again put to the test—when the throne of Louis Phillippe shall be overturned, and his despotic sceptre broken—and when the tricolor will no longer wave, in solemn mockery, over the palace of a King, but will float in the air the expressive symbol of popular feeling.

"A country with a monarchy cannot be free: where there is a sovereignty of an individual, there cannot be the sovereignty of the people—and this latter sovereignty is the only one which should exist.—More powers than one in a state are irreconcileable; they are as incompatible with peace and happiness as two masters in one house. Sovereignty cannot be divisible: there must be one power—one sovereignty; and that must be the people. The people's will may be accomplished by means of one delegated or vicarious executive; but the people alone should decide and order the measures which that executive is to see accomplished."

Again he says:—"The hope that France will speedily become a Republic, not only influences many a wealthy, and many a talented individual in his mansion in the great city; but also inspires the poorest laborer in his cottage, at the foot of the Pyrenees. This hope—ardent, burning, and enthusiastic—has moved, and agitates still the lowest as well as the highest strata of French society. The world too—the whole civilized world—is interested in this momentous question; for all revolutions are cosmopolitan. Their influence produces political changes everywhere. The execution of a King at Whitehall, in London, and upon the Place de la Revolution in Paris, at different epochs, destroyed that charm—that *prestige*—which had once belonged to regal rank."

HOOD'S UP THE RHINE.

Croton, the intelligent New-York correspondent of the Providence Journal, pays the following compliment to Hood, "the greatest living wits, and the most melancholy man in London, who seldom smiles himself, yet who makes the world laugh and cry at his will." Croton says:

"Scarcely had England done laughing over Hood's quaint sketches of German life, when the 'Song of the Shirt' breaks out like a shriek of despair, piercing the universal heart of humanity, and putting all the 'relief societies' in Christendom to the blush, to 'shame and confusion of face.' He was originally designed for an engraver, but was himself too grave to act the 'graver,' and now, with one foot on the threshold of the tomb, on the way, as he would be likely to express it, to the 'Diet of Worms,' his alternate pathos and humor make up the strongest lights and shadows of the literary life in London. Who but Hood could have found an answer for the German Jew, when upbraided for extracting the unlawful interest of 9 per cent. and when asked how the Almighty would regard this cruel usury—in the reply, that, 'when God looked down upon it *from above*, the 9 would appear like 6!'—a sophistry, I think, which must have been adopted in Wall street.'

Graham House, New Arrangement.

ROSWELL GOSS informs his friends and the public, that he has enlarged his Boarding Establishment, known as the

GRAHAM HOUSE, 62 BARCLAY STREET,

by adding to it the adjoining house, and is prepared to accommodate transient or permanent Boarders on the most favorable terms. All friends of Temperance desiring a quiet home, and freedom from the fumes of Alcohol and Tobacco, are invited to patronize this house. The vegetable system will be strictly adhered to, but a table will be served for those who prefer a mixed diet. Croton shower and warm baths free.

October 17. ROSWELL GOSS.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages. Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress.* The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her.

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations*, in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

(Second Edition.)

JUST Published, and for sale at this office, a new work on Capital Punishment. By Charles Spear. It contains a variety of thrilling and instructive anecdotes; also, all the capital offenses in every State in the Union; and a speech from O'Connell on the subject. Also, several instances of the execution of the *innocent*. Facts are drawn from history and observation, and the entire scripture ground has been examined. The work is embellished with a fine engraving. Price, 62 1-2 cents.

Education and Industry!

THE Northampton Association of Education and Industry have appropriated a suitable tenement for the accommodation of fifteen or twenty boarding pupils. There will be members of a family, under the care of the Director of Education, assisted by his wife, and other teachers, and will be subject to the same treatment and regulations as pupils who are members of the association—The name of the association indicates the idea of culture, towards the realization of which our efforts will be directed. Systematic, habitual industry is deemed indispensable to education, which should aim at the harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious tendencies in active, practical life.

We shall consider $100 a year as an equivalent for instruction and board; from which a suitable deduction will be made when a pupil comes for several years. The year will commence on the 1st of May, next, and will have no fixed and entire vacation. Pupils will be received for a year at any time.

O. MACK, *Director of Education.*

BROUGHTON MEADOWS, Northampton, April 14, 1844.

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE.

No. 31, North Fifth street.

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, will be issued regularly from this office, on Thursday of every week.

TERMS—the same as in New-York; i. e. $2,00 a year if paid in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months. $10,00 in advance will pay for six copies for one year, sent to one address; and $30,00 will pay for twenty copies.

A full assortment of anti-slavery publications is kept constantly on hand. Also, a handsome variety of miscellaneous books, and useful and fancy stationery.

All letters relating to the business of the office should be directed to *J. Miller McKim*, No. 31 North Fifth

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

CYRUS M. BURLEIGH, Plainfield, Ct.
CHARLES ATKINSON, Marion, Grant co. Ia.
EDWARD M. DAVIS, Philadelphia, Penn.
J. MILLER M